UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. III JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1951 No. 3

H. SCHMIDT, S. J.
The Dutch Reformed Church in 1950

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.
Russian Orthodoxy and Anglicanism

DAVID LATHOUD, A. A.
Fernand Portal and Portalism

S. TYSZKIEWICZ, S. J.
The Position of the Russian Church in the U. S. S. R.

ALEXANDER MIRCEA
The Rumanian Spirit and Catholicism

DUNSTAN DONOVAN, S. A.
Father Paul of Graymoor

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
How a Chinese Martyr Dies for Christ—An Anglican Protest

NEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N.Y.

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia
Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

May 22, 1951

The Dutch Reformed Church in 1950

THE YEAR 1950 was a significant one in the life of the Dutch Reformed Church (*Nederlandse Hervormede Kerk*), a community which has been a subject of live interest in the religious world at large since the Ecumenical Congress of Amsterdam in 1948. It was marked by great activity in matters bearing upon relations with the Catholic Church and by the publication of three important booklets which we shall deal with here.

For some time relations between Protestants and Catholics have been quite active in Holland. The import of the developments that came to a head in 1950 seem to indicate that these relations have been fruitful. First, they have helped to draw a clear line of demarcation between Roman Catholicism and the Reformation, and thus it becomes apparent that there are no grounds for fears that Catholic principles will be diluted by contacts with dissident personalities. Secondly, they have helped a number of Protestants to clarify their minds on various aspects of their own confession. Some eminent representatives of Protestantism have become conscious of their shaky foundations in matter of ecclesiology, and they no longer hesitate to profess and to maintain a large part of Catholic dogma. Wherefore, it could be concluded that discussions between Catholics and Protestants should be looked upon as a form of apostolic work.

Pastoral Letter of the General Synod.

On March 23, 1950, the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church published a Pastoral Letter on the Roman Catholic Church.[1] This letter had been occasioned by serious concern felt because of the constantly growing power of the Catholic Church, as well as by consideration of the deplorable fact that two forms of Christianity is contrary to the will of Christ who prayed for unity. It may well be understood as an effort of the Protestants to give testimony to God's truth as they believe to find it in Holy Scripture.

The first question asked is as follows: "Where is the Church of Christ? What message have we to preach? The question which the mere existence of the Roman Catholic Church places before us persuades us to search anew in the Revelation of God." (p. 5) What then should be the criterium for resolving the problem imposed by the grievous difference? According to the Pastoral Letter a search should be made in the testimony of Sacred Scripture which alone "is the sole norm by which a judgment can be made upon what should be preached as divine truth. Any body which claims to be a Church of Jesus Christ must compare itself with it and be justified by it." (p. 6)

One after another, the most outstanding divergencies are examined in the light of Biblical Revelation: the cult of Mary, the concept of man, the doctrine of grace, and the relation by which the word and the sacrament are bound one to another. In particular, the Catholic notions of ministry, holy orders, hierarchy, and papal authority are examined. In conclusion, the Synod's thesis of the Catholic Church is presented, according to which she rests only upon terrestrial guarantees which have not been promised, and of which they are consequently not in need. "And the Word is given over to earthly powers who dominate it and who obscure its reign." (p. 44) Likewise,

1) *Herderlijk Schrijven van de Generale Synode der Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk* (Pastoral Letter of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church,) Gravenhage, Boekencentrum N.V., 1950, 96 pp.

the Catholic doctrine of cooperation between man and grace, and the possibility of losing grace is rejected.

The Letter continues with a definition of the characteristics which distinguish the two forms of Christianity. It finds the chief difference in the Catholic tendency to attribute to man in relation to grace a greater independence than what they deem warranted by Scripture. The foundation of this tendency is the "realization" of grace. By this term is understood the fettering of Jesus Christ and His grace to the official apparatus of the Church. There results an anticipation of that which is promised to us only at the final consummation. By an identification of grace with powers, men and earthly means, and in making man independent, the Roman Catholic Church places limitations upon God's omnipotence and the freedom of grace itself. Hence the rejection.

The Letter then deals with the position of the Catholic Church in social life. It discovers not only evangelical solicitude, but in addition, a permanent tendency to enlarge, to extend, and to augment her power and her own glory. The Church has penetrated into every field of human life, especially into marital life. Intolerance, the tendency to gain power, and the impossibility of critically examining her own activity are constant characteristics.

But is it not possible for this Church to return upon her steps? Is she not capable of acquiring a better understanding of Revelation? The Synod says no. "We are conscious of the fact that the Roman Catholic Church does not perceive that breach which exists between Holy Scripture and herself, and that she cannot recognize it without suppressing herself. Herein is a clearly marked difference which distinguishes her from the Churches of the Reformation." (p. 71)

The Letter foresees the Catholic reply to this assertion which argues that disastrous consequences follow from the reading and the understanding of Scripture without the guidance of the Church. It counters by stating that the exegetical divergencies do not arise from any obscurity of Holy Scripture, but from the limitations of our understanding; it is incapable of embracing divine truth in its inexhaustible richness. The Reformation dared to admit free interpretation out of respect for the freedom of the Word of God and in the confidence that the Spirit of God will never cease to effect unity in fundamental ideas. But, the Letter would have it, there is neither impoverishment nor any narrowing down of revelation in these ideas.

Concerning this confrontation with Holy Scripture, the General Synod makes the following conclusions:

"In view of her official doctrines and practices, we are obliged to call her (the Roman Catholic Church) a *disobedient* church. Nevertheless, in saying this, we are not unmindful of the numerous signs of disobedience and deviation that one finds in the churches of the Reformation. The great difference rests in this that for the churches of the Reformation the way of conversion remains open, and through their conversion they return to their own essence, whereas in the Roman Catholic Church the disobedience is connected with her official form and with her permanent characteristics, in such wise that *she cannot convert without turning away from her essence and without denying herself.*" (p. 78)

Catholic Reactions.

The Catholics, on their side, took the Pastoral Letter seriously, published numerous reactions and followed the developments attentively. It became

known as the "book of the year." Replies were made to the dogmatic as well as to the social part of the Letter. A reading of these considerations shows a certain agreement on the principal points of view, along with noteworthy differences of attitude, or more properly, of mentality.

Some find the Letter an insult to the Catholic Church. They point to the crude tone of certain phrases, and refer to the "good friends" who are speaking here, and who "do not wish" to understand us. They disapprove of the Letter above all because it is out of harmony with the ecumenical movement and bitterly anti-Roman. It is imbued with fear and mistrust, issues from distorted sentiments, and breathes "irenic anti-papalism." One reviewer finds it truly a pity that an official document should be precipitated among the Dutch people to trouble peaceful understanding, increase mistrust, and hinder mutual cooperation with such gratuitous accusations.

There are others who, without closing their eyes to the faults of the Letter, make an attempt to comprehend the point of view of its authors. They believe that if the Pastors recoil so abruptly from the Catholic Church, it is not because of ill will nor because of anti-papalism, nor even from a superficial examination. They are merely obeying the exigencies of their faith, and their devotion to that which they hold as divine truth. One commentator went so far to write that according to the spirit of Protestantism, it is impossible to take any other view of the Catholic Church than that described in the Pastoral Letter, even though many considerations are exclusively dominated by accidental circumstances and by observations of accessory details which have been given over-emphasis. In this order of thought, one begins to wonder how the false interpretation of Catholicism came about, if we did not in some way make it possible, and how a progressive rapprochement could be put into action. Yet the tone of the reactions for the most part is serene and objective. Only here and there does one find bitter terms of indignation which serve no good purpose.

Reply from the University of Nimeguen.

A letter signed by five professors of the Catholic University of Nimeguen was published toward the end of October, 1950.[2] It is a vigorous reply, and bristling with indignation. The objectors are astounded that the Protestants unreasonably misconstrue various points of Catholic doctrine, and especially that they misunderstand the true motives and intentions of the Catholic Church. The refutation is forceful, but not all the professors succeed in presenting pertinent arguments, probably because there were those among them who had never had much experience in living in contact with Protestants.

Professor W.H. van den Pol, a convert, begins with the basic tendency of the Letter. He asks whether the Synod could not have tried to understand that the Catholic idea is also a complete submission to the Word of God. If the Catholic obeys the Church, it is precisely "because he fears to submit himself to a personal interpretation of Holy Scripture," because "he has no other intention than to submit, in perfect obedience, to the authentic meaning and to the real intention of the Word of God. . . . The Synod could believe that the Catholic errs because the word of God is only contained in Scripture, but

2) *Antwoord op het herderlijk schrijven van de Generale Synode van de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk betreffende de Rooms-Katholieke Kerk door vijf Hoogleraren van de R.K. Universiteit te Nijmegen.* Reply to the Pastoral Letter of the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church concerning the Catholic Church by Five Professors of the Catholic University of Nimeguen,) Utrecht-Brussells, Het Spectrum, 1950.

why not declare loyally before the members of its confession that both one and the other, the Catholics and the Protestants of the Reformation, are equally diligent in obeying the Word of God in Holy Scripture." It should have given the members of its confession to understand that "obedience to the Word of God" can signify nothing else to the Catholic than obedience to Scripture but understood in the totality of divine tradition and not in the sense of "obedience to Scripture alone." (p. 18)

Professor G.P. Kreling, O.P. analyzed the judgment which the Letter makes upon Catholic dogma. His criticism is clear, conclusive, and decisive. An evident familiarity with Protestant concepts and terminology adds assurance to the merit of this theologian's comments. All too often the Catholic specialist remains quite unintelligible to non-Catholics because he remains confined within a system and a vocabulary which the uninitiated are unable to grasp. Kreling shows that the statements of the Letter are often couched in words of such biased colouring that they risk leading to misconceptions; for example, "the recompense which will be *payed* in Heaven," and "a supernatural *part* of man which was lost by the Fall, and a natural part which persisted." Nevertheless, he concedes that the choice of terms used in the Letter could have been found in certain more or less out-of-date Catholic text books. He also shows that the Synod on various occasions has used a Catholic statement of a proposition which was intended to condemn a particular heresy as if it were an adequate definition of the total content of a Catholic doctrine.

It is worth repeating that the exceptional merit of Kreling is his ability to maintain the absolute integrity of Catholic doctrine, while phrasing the disputed points in a terminology which is intelligible for a Reformed public, and without dissimulating differences, to present them uncoloured by tendentious exaggeration or bias. He frequently succeeds in separating the true from the false in the Synod's maze of inferences and allegations, and this in one simple phrase styled in a way that is familiar to the Protestant mind. To cite an example: The Synod objects to the Catholic concept of man. It affirms that, according to us, fallen man continues to dispose of many different gifts and powers, by virtue of which he will be able to make great progress in the purely natural field, and will be able even to prepare himself with the aid of his free will for the reception of grace. At various points the Synod makes further reference to this chapter in comparative terms, speaking vaguely of unregenerate man who is still capable of many things. Professor Kreling replies: "We do not pretend that unregenerate man is capable of many things and that he makes great progress; we merely affirm that all the actions of the sinner do not accrue for him a new debt with respect to God, even though all that he does is conditioned by the sterility of his sinful condition." (p. 29)

Professor W.K.M. Grossouw examines the argumentation which the Pastoral Letter founded upon Scripture. First, he declares that the Catholic and the Protestant never have a common point of departure in exegesis in the sense of an admission—even as regards method—that Holy Scripture is the sole norm for judging the content of divine revelation. He says, "It is evident that Scripture itself leads us further, not to a higher authority, but to a broader stream with which it has been integrated from the beginning." (p. 48) Professor Grossouw places the Protestant and Catholic views clearly face to face one with another, but it may be that he has not succeeded in explaining

conclusively that the Protestant is incapable of pure theological exegesis of Scripture. When he maintains that the doctrine of Holy Church is not in conflict with the findings of Scripture, the Protestants are not altogether wrong in believing that they find the elements of Tradition even in this argument. It is impossible for a Catholic to force a separation between Scripture and Tradition, and it is rather the reason for this impossibility that should be explained to the Protestant. Yet many of the observations that Professor Grossouw directs to the Synod are well worthy of its considerations. He declares, "The Scriptural arguments of the Pastoral Letter are almost all biased, and many of them cannot be supported by exegetical means. One could have expected better of a Church which seeks the whole of revealed truth in Scripture." It might have been more correct to state baldly that one may not expect better of a Church which seeks the whole of revelated truth in Scripture.

Professor L.J. Rogier, in dealing with the subject of intolerance, refers to the lack of tolerance on the part of both Catholics and Protestants in the past. He shows that the spirit of the times, as well as the political and economical factors played a large role in the hardy Christian struggles and persecutions that were waged from both sides. In our estimation, a thorough study of the problem of tolerance would have been more fruitful in this discussion than a dissertation on the intolerance of past days.

Professor L.J.M. Beel deals with the Catholic Church in its relations with social life. The author is to be complimented for his sympathetic tone, but he is apparently not at home in this particular field. He has lost an opportunity for showing that the glory of God and the interests of the Church coincide, and consequently, that the Synod is not justified in condemning the Roman Church for adopting suitable means for the defense of her interests.

Various Criticisms.

It should not be a matter of surprise if this Pastoral Letter was the occasion for some Catholic reviewers to make some harsh though salutary criticisms. They ask repeatedly why the Synod should have been moved to make a false and harmful interpretation of Catholic life. They not only level their reproaches at the Protestants, demonstrating that they deform truth, that they have insufficient knowledge of Catholic doctrine, and that they have permitted themselves to become bitter because of the flourishing progress of the Catholic Church in Holland. They go further. They ask whether the Protestants do not find some grounds for their unflattering interpretation in the concrete, exterior form which the Church presents in Holland. Is the true character of the Church manifested clearly enough in the conduct of the Dutch Catholics? Is Christ's community of charity sufficiently evident in Catholic religious life? Is the conduct of the Catholic always in conformity with the sanctity of the Church of Christ? If the Protestants insist upon a constant tendency among the Catholics to sieze power, must one place the whole blame on their ill will, or do we offer them some grounds for arriving at such an opinion? Perhaps there are those who display excessive zeal in cultivating the authoritative aspect of the Church. Perhaps there have been occasions when more importance has been given to prestige and social eminence than to the development of the Kingdom of God in souls. Certainly, we should avoid allowing the slightest pretext for stirring up anti-clericalism. Those who are profoundly educated in a sense of a mystical community are

shocked by official rigidity and can easily receive the impression that we fix our attention principally upon obedience and submission, upon conformity with prescribed rules of action and official organizations, and not sufficiently upon faith and personal responsibility. It may be that a more modest tone and a less peremptory mode of expression in giving admonitions and imposing decisions would permit the feeling that it is not a matter of power and of great numbers, but of Christ and His influence that inspires the life of the Catholic Church. Juridical acts are indeed necessary for the administration of Christian life, and they are justified by the express will of Christ. Nevertheless, there is room to wonder whether it would not be prudent to introduce an element of mildness into the constitutional framework. It would testify more vividly to the life of charity, and especially would it reflect our solicitude for those who do not belong to the one Fold.

It was also asked whether all priests are sufficiently concerned with the divisions between Christians, and if they are sufficiently zealous in furthering the triumph of truth. The Pastoral Letter affirms that the clergy not only tolerates all sorts of useless customs, but that they even defend and favor them. Popular piety too often develops along the lines of non-essential details to be lost in multiple practices and customs that relegate Christ and the faith to the background. But the Faith is born and has its increase in the preaching of the Gospel.

This internal criticism need not be looked upon as out of place nor disrespectful. It arises from a jealous love of Christ and His immaculate Spouse. The best means of defending them will always be the realization of the Christian ideal in oneself and in one's community. We do not have the right to call ourselves perfect because it is our task to build up to the perfect stature and the mature measure of Christ's fullness. (Eph. IV, 13.) Our praises will never be sufficiently generous for Christ's Person and His gifts, but when considering how poorly feeble man corresponds to his sublime ideal in actuality, the *Miserere* becomes as appropriate as the *Magnificat,* and superlative praises are forgot. In fact, one of the most precious benefits produced by contact between Catholics and Protestants in Holland is a certain stimulation of healthy internal criticism. It generates efforts of improvement. But there are persons who deplore internal criticism, possibly because they lack keen sensitivity to the great demands which real Catholic life makes upon their brothers in Christ. They are moreover, thrown into the awkward position of having to parry without rest against the non-Catholic attacks and criticisms. How much better it would be if they could become convinced that integral criticism does not attain either Christ's holiness nor that of His Spouse, but is concerned exclusively with imperfections that hinder due correspondence between man and divine grace.

"Reformation and Catholicity".

A booklet entitled *Reformation and Catholicity*[3] was published at the beginning of 1950, almost at the same time as the Pastoral Letter of the General Synod. This publication contains a declaration addressed to all those who love the Church of Jesus Christ and is signed by 29 Dutch Protestants. There is reason to wonder whether this almost simultaneous publication of

3) *Hervorming en Catholiciteit: een verklaring. Commentaren bijeengebracht door J. Loos en J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink* (Reformation and Catholicity; a declaration.) (Commentaries collected by J. Loos and J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink.) Rotterdam, D. van Sign & Zonen, 1950, 85 pp.

the two declarations would not signify that the message of the General Synod was mitigated by this pamphlet. In this work the members of the Reformed Church seem to attack the principles of the Reformation and to adopt a Romeward orientation, even though their conception of Catholicism remains decidedly different from our own. It is true that the Pastoral Letter nowhere mentions this booklet and contains no direct allusion to it. Nevertheless, the fact that the Reformed Church of Holland finds itself obliged to make an official clarification of the Roman Church for its flock combined with the motivations ascribed above, namely the ever increasing tendency of the Catholic Church to mount to power and the lamentable lack of unity among Christians, justifies the supposition that some menace of schism within the Dutch Reformed Church has obliged the General Synod to deliver a grave word of concern and warning concerning the Roman danger.

The editors of the series of commentaries on the Declaration, J. Loos and J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, declare in the preface, which bears the date of March, 1949: "The authors of the following commentaries on the *Declaration addressed to all those who love the Church of Jesus Christ* do not think they have exhausted in depth or in breadth the questions latent in the proportion: *Reformation and Catholicity*. The reader will find here a short, authentic interpretation of the content of the *Declaration* which strives to place in an ecumenical, i.e., Catholic light certain capital points of the Reformed life now renewing itself." (p. 5)

It should be remarked that J. N. Bakhuizen, one of the editors, did not place his name among the 29 signers of the *Declaration*.

We quote in full the text of the Declaration:

"In these last few years, the new consciousness of the essence and the meaning of the Church, the Body of Christ, dominates theological life and ecclesiastical activity to a remarkably large extent.

"In Holland, as everywhere in the world, the opinion is gaining ground that a problem of such eminent importance as is the aspiration toward the unity of the Church will not find a durable solution unless all those who confess the name of Christ become aware that they are members of the same Mystical Body. Moreover, to speak humanly, these efforts are based upon the conviction that this new consciousness is the sole way of salvation for our ruined culture and the unique synthesis in which all the political and social tensions will find their godly solution.

"The Dutch Christians are among the first in those matters which have to do with finding the appropriate means to supply the need felt by Christians everywhere to give substance to the fullness of Christ, not only in personal confession and in the living of the Christian life, but also in the exterior physiognomy of the Church. They are convinced that fundamentally it is a question of making the splendor of the Body of Christ prevail in, and when necessary, against the world.

"A new interest in the confession of faith, in ecclesiastical discipline, and liturgical forms are proof of this reawakening in the church life of our days.

"We also gratefully acknowledge what the Spirit of God has awakened and effected up to the present time in our land, and especially in the Dutch Reformed Church: reconstruction of the community, ecclesiastical discussion, and a more apt instrumentation of the Church through the establishment of counsels and commissions. It is true that we are asking ourselves whether by reason of this very situation there does not lurk among us a new

danger menacing ecclesiastical life and thought; namely, that of attributing an absolute value to certain views that are held in a part of the Reformation, that is, within the Protestantism which is called Reformed, especially in the Puritanical form which it has assumed in our country. With respect to the Catholic idea, we find a new tendency to seek our force in our spiritual isolation. In spite of our official criticism of the Catholic concept of Tradition, we perceive the establishment and the almost open usage of a Reformed tradition. We ask ourselves to what degree this signifies the sacrifice of a reforming principle, especially since we do not consider the Reformation as a movement sprung from human individualism, but as an effort engendered by obedience to faith and intended to make a fresh comparison of the concrete and existing Church with Holy Scripture. We are persuaded that a new confrontation is obligatory for a reforming church and that all the acquisitions of exegetical and historical investigation should be utilized even if they should lead to a new Reformation. We believe, for example, that with respect to the theological situation of our days, the wholly unique meaning of the Incarnation of the Word in its entire extension, embracing the totality of creation, offers points of departure for a much more positive relation between nature and grace, and between creation and regeneration, than that which is usually accepted at the present time in the churches of the Reformation.

"Proceeding from this basic idea, we wish to draw attention to the following points:

"1. We believe that the Church finds the Revelation given her in Jesus Christ established in Holy Scripture (i.e., in the words of the Prophets and the Apostles) as the essence and norm of faith and life.

"2. We also believe that she is forever obliged to adhere to the confession of faith of the undivided Church when she exercises the task confided to her of explaining Holy Scripture. Wherefore, we ask ourselves if for the Church of today there could truly be reasonable motive for presenting this confession of faith of the undivided Church as something to be discussed anew direct from Holy Scripture.

"3. We believe that Jesus Christ instituted the Sacraments as conductors of His gifts of grace. In regard to Baptism, we believe that this Holy Sacrament was instituted by Our Lord Himself as the bath of regeneration in which we are purified of original sin, and in which the renewing force of divine life is infused, in such wise that in this Sacrament we are sanctified in Christ. Hence, we ask ourselves whether it is correct to teach that this Sacrament is merely the confirmation and ratification of a divine gift of grace whose presence is supposed also before and outside the Sacrament, perhaps by virtue of the concept of divine covenant.

"As concerns the Holy Sacrament of the Last Supper, we confess that Our Lord Jesus Christ is essentially, really, and truly present in a mysterious and hidden manner, and gives His most holy Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine as food and drink for eternal life. We believe that this holy Sacrament makes present in our times the Sacrifice which was consummated by Him one time only upon the Cross, and that we participate in the fruits of this fully satisfying Sacrifice when taking part in this Sacrament.

"This is the reason that we ask ourselves whether this Sacrament is estimated at its true value when it is taught that it is merely the sign and confirmation of the salvation which is accorded in the word of preaching.

"4. We believe that the Incarnation of the Word is continued in the

Holy Church until the end of the world. This is why we confess that the Church is the Body of the Son of God in which He Himself continues to live among us, and that in her He instituted the Order of the Apostles and *Opzieners* (Overseers) instituted by Him, the communication of His Holy Spirit forever, and that this office rests upon a special calling of grace and a setting apart to this holy ministry by the Lord of the Church Himself. This is why we ask ourselves the question of whether it is advisable for any church whatsoever to withdraw itself from this apostolic succession and whether the office is not underestimated when it is considered as a mere specialization of the sacred function proper to all the faithful; furthermore, whether we do not play with grace if we continue to administer the holy Sacraments undisturbed while at the same time neglecting this tradition of the Church which had been maintained from the beginning, without asking ourselves the question of whether we possess the divine authorization required for the distribution of the holy sacraments and without seriously seeking the solution of these problems.

"Because of what has been said above, we are convinced that for our people there is no other true, religious and ecclesiastical possibility for the future than in seeking deliberately to unite ourselves with the historical line of Christian confession and life, of faith and ecclesiastical discipline from which we find ourselves absolutely separated.

"For this reason we are making a call to join in an effort of profound and common reflection on all these points.

"Whoever meditates upon these things seriously will immediately perceive how vast is the untilled ground that remains to be plowed up.

"Only union of prayer aided by a common labor will be able, humanly speaking, to open the roads by which the planting of the faith in the Lowlands beside the sea which was done centuries ago may be cultivated and brought to its full growth in the Una Sancta which embraces the Universe." (pp. 7-10)

A study of the Declaration and the commentaries which more fully develop and clarify it, gives one clearly to understand that it signifies an attempt to promote a change in Dutch Protestantism: a passage from "reformed Protestantism, particularly from the Protestantism which is called Reformed, especially in the Puritanical form which it has assumed in our country" (p. 8) to a form of Protestantism similar to that which has taken form among the more advanced Anglicans. It is a passage from the "Reformed" concept toward the "Catholic" concept of the ancient undivided Church.

It is quite clear that the Declaration marks an approach toward Catholic doctrine. The Catholic will be impressed by the last two commentaries in which the authors hover very close to that doctrine—those of Pastor H. Miskotte on the Last Supper and Pastor H. Loos on Apostolic Orders. This permeation of Catholic thought leads one to the encouraging notion that the contacts on the theological level between Catholics and Protestants which have been nurtured in these past years have born some fruit, and have opened the way for the Spirit of Truth to lead the Protestants along the road of their own "free interpretation" toward the rediscovery of some fundamental Catholic truths. Principally, the problems of modern Catholic theology, the doctrine of the Church, the value of Tradition and the liturgical movement, have stirred our separated Dutch brethren profoundly and have urged them to brave action.

We should not suppose, however, that these persons have sacrificed the

Reformation. They consider it "an effort engendered by obedience to faith which was intended to make a fresh comparison of the concrete and existing Church with Holy Scripture." They expressly differ on various points with the Catholic Church (essential points such as Mariology and the Primacy of Peter and his successors are not even taken into consideration.) What they deny is the "Reformed" form of Protestantism, and what they desire is not Roman Catholicism, but some sort of evangelical catholicity. It remains to be seen whether they ever succeed in building it within the framework of the Dutch Reformed Church. The Pastoral Letter of the General Synod would hardly permit such an expectation since it combats not only Roman Catholicism, but all catholicity. However, Catholics know that total and truly evangelical catholicism is found in Roman Catholicism alone, and have good reason to hope that the benign motion of the Holy Spirit will lead them even further along the catholicizing road until they discover their goal in the one true Church.

H. Schmidt, S.J.

Russian Orthodoxy and Anglicanism*

The Reformation had not long been established before German, Dutch and English theologians aided by their respective ambassadors and consuls on Turkish soil on the one hand and Catholic theologians, mainly Jesuits, supported by French diplomacy on the other, were trying to win the oppressed Church of Constantinople to their side. One result of these endeavours was an Orthodox friendship with the Church of England which led to correspondence, to the gift by Constantinople to Charles I, King of England, of the famous Codex Alexandrinus of the Bible, and to the sojourn in Oxford of a number of Greek theological students, for a time in a college put at their disposal and then called the Greek College—now Worcester College. These events belong to the XVII century.

The XVIII century saw further relations between England and the East, which this time brought contact also with the Church of Russia. The deposition of James II from the English throne and the accession of William and Mary (1688) led a group of English bishops and clergy to go into schism from the established Church on the grounds that they could not repudiate the oath of allegiance they had taken to the deposed monarch. They were in consequence styled the Nonjurors. In the early years of the XVIII century, on the occasion of a begging tour by a group of Orthodox ecclesiastics of the Church of Alexandria, these Nonjurors conceived the idea of union between themselves and the Eastern Churches, and a long correspondence ensued, in which both proposals from the Nonjurors and replies from Constantinople were transmitted through the good offices of Peter the Great and the Holy Synod of Russia.

The first reply of the Patriarchs was the product of a Synod at Constantinople convened for this end: the last was a copy of the "Confession of Dositheus" that a council in Jerusalem had approved (1672) as an answer to Calvinism. The Greeks throughout intimated that union meant the adherence of others to the Orthodox Church, which alone was the Church of Christ, and they yielded no point of traditional Orthodox doctrine—acceptance of all the decrees of the first seven General Councils; the rejection of the Filioque clause; the sanctity of Holy Tradition; the Real Presence and the Real Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist (they even approved the term "transubstantiation"); seven sacraments; the veneration of Our Lady and the Saints and their images. The Nonjurors, for their part, exposed their views in long arguments from the Scripture and the Fathers, and it is unlikely that any tangible result would have come from the correspondence, even had circumstances allowed it to continue indefinitely which, however, they did not.

This, at any rate, would seem to have been the first ecclesiastical contact between Anglicans and the Russian Orthodox. Peter the Great was enthusiastic for union between East and West (it fitted in so neatly with his own westernising policy) and the Holy Synod, in spite of the firmness of the replies of the four Eastern Patriarchates, was equally favourable. The Nonjurors were invited to send two representatives to Moscow to discuss theological questions and undoubtedly they would have done so, had not Peter's death

*) The terms *Orthodoxy and Orthodox* are properly applicable to the faith professed by that Church which has at its head the successor of Peter, and which consequently enjoys the guarantee of Christ's promises in maintaining the integrity of divine revelation in the exercise of its Magisterium. For convenience' sake they are used here in their widely accepted sense as mere nomenclature of the separated Oriental Christian groups who accept the Seven First Councils.

(1725) put an end to the whole project. Before negotiations could be resumed with the Empress Catherine, Archbishop Wake of Canterbury had written to Constantinople disclosing the schismatical nature of his English correspondents (which perhaps the Russians also did not know of) and no more was heard of the proposal of union.

More than a hundred years were to pass before there was further contact between Anglicans and Russian Orthodox, during which period the Church of England witnessed many changes. The brothers Wesley had tried to introduce an element of evangelical zeal into the placid, latitudinarian Church life and, rejected by the ecclesiastical authorities, had gone into the schism of Methodism. But their spirit was not unfelt and produced the Anglican Evangelicanism of the end of the XVIII century. The first quarter of the next century, however, saw the first fiery zeal of Evangelicanism in the Church of England dying down to a lukewarm glow and then came the Oxford Movement which revived what Catholic elements were left within the English Church and brought a new consciousness to its adherents of the existence of other Churches and of Anglican relations with them.

One of the many who fell under the influence of the Oxford Movement was William Palmer of Magdalen College, Oxford, deacon in the Church of England. His interest in the religious ferment of the day lay not so much in the home activities of the Tractarians as in promoting contact and union with Churches abroad. An opportunity was soon offered him of approach to the Russian Church by the visit to Oxford on May 21, 1839 of the Grand Duke Alexander of Russia and the Duke of Wellington. Palmer profited by the occasion to request that a Russian ecclesiastic be sent to Oxford to acquaint himself with Anglican theology and that he himself might have the Emperor's protection, should he visit Russia for a similar object. So began Palmer's long Odyssey.

Palmer visited Russia for the first time the very next year. Armed with a letter of recommendation from the President of Magdalen, Dr. Routh, requesting that he be admitted to "communion in the sacraments" in the Church of Russia, and in no way deterred by the refusal of the other Oxford College authorities to give "any encouragement to the idea of intercommunion with the idolatrous Greek Church," and of Dr. Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of All England, to lend his approval to the project, he reached St. Petersburg on August 11, 1840. Palmer's chief desire was to communicate in the Russian Church, and according to his ecclesiological views, he saw no reason why that should not be allowed. His first task, therefore, was to persuade the Russians on two points—that his faith was sound; and that it was the official faith of the whole Anglican Church.

On both of these points he found the Russians sceptical and so, while at the same time learning the Russian language the better to study Orthodox theology, he was plunged into frequent discussion and controversy while he was waiting for the Holy Synod to consider his request. Meantime there occurred an incident which was to play a large part in his own theological development. The Russian Princess Galitzin, resident in Geneva, was converted to Anglicanism and formally received into the Anglican Church. As Palmer believed that this was against the spirit and teaching of his own Church, to receive converts from another Branch of the Church Universal, he assured her husband Prince Galitzin, that it could not be true—she must, he said, have

joined some form of Methodism—and declared that he would prove his assertion or himself join the Russian Church.

Early in 1841 he was back at Oxford where he published a volume entitled "Aids to Reflexion on the seemingly double Character of the Established Church," wherein he attacked the Protestant spirit of the Anglican Church which had been the main difficulty he had encountered in his Russian discussions and urged an approach to the principles of the Orthodox East. In 1843 he found Princess Galitzin in Paris, a communicant member of an Anglican group, so he persuaded Bishop Luscombe, the Ordinary of that group, to refuse her communion. That brought on him the enmity of the Princess who, on her return to Russia, did her best to convince the Holy Synod of the Protestant character of Anglicanism.

In October of that same year 1843 Palmer returned to Russia but only to learn that the Holy Synod had refused his request mainly on the grounds that his views on the 39 Articles were not those of his Church generally. More discussions followed and finally Palmer went so far as publicly to anathematize before the Synod a series of propositions which, it was asserted, were either contained in or could easily be deduced from the 39 Articles. Confident that his Church agreed with his interpretation of the formulary, Palmer returned to England to seek official approval of his profession of faith and confirmation of the anathemas. Meanwhile there had begun that remarkable series of letters between Palmer and Alexis Khomiakoff, the leader of the slavophile tendency in Russian orthodoxy which continues to this day.

On his return Palmer received cold comfort from Archbishop Howley of Canterbury and so turned to the bishops of the Episcopal Church of Scotland whose approval for his acts he tried to obtain by books published in 1846 and 1849. Failing also in this he took steps to enter the Orthodox Church. Two journeys to Greece brought him into contact with the Patriarch of Constantinople who demanded rebaptism as a condition of reception. To Palmer's objection that the Church of Russia asked no more than a form of reconciliation without baptism, Anthimius of Constantinople replied that the Greeks knew of only one baptism and that, if the Russians admitted any other, they neither knew of it nor recognized it. That ended Palmer's relations with Orthodoxy and on February 28, 1855 he was received into the Catholic Church.

To give a full account of the discussions between Palmer and the Russian theologians would take too long and be out of proportion to the purpose before us of making a general survey of Anglo-Russian relations. But it is useful to note the chief heads of controversy for the light they throw both on the extreme Anglo-Catholic opinions and on the current Russian theology of that day. Palmer expressed his views, which he genuinely thought to be also those of his Communion, on the nature of the Church to the Metropolitan Philaret in these words: "The one visible Catholic Church on Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, is at this time divided by differences about secondary matters into three local parts, all agreeing in the necessary faith, viz., the Orthodox Eastern Churches and the Western, the latter being subdivided into the Continental and the British. In their respective dioceses each holds original and legitimate jurisdiction. And if, in consequence of *de facto* quarrels between them, any bishop of either of the three seeks to draw away Christians from the other two, to organize them into separate congregations of his own way of thinking, thus making points of difference

into points of essential faith, we say that these new congregations are schismatical."

The Russians, however, were not to be persuaded that this was the genuine doctrine of the Anglican Church and they found confirmation of their doubt in the fact that Palmer could never present credentials from his own Church authorities. The main obstacle, however, to the gratification of Palmer's wishes was the 39 Articles. No matter how earnestly he asserted a Catholic interpretation of them—and with time his own views about them developed in a more orthodox sense—his inability to obtain an official Anglican approval for his views only confirmed the Russians in their conclusion that he in no way represented his Church which was radically Protestant.

The Russians from the beginning maintained the attitude that the Orthodox Church alone was the Church of Christ and that the only way to union was for Palmer and his Church to modify the 39 Articles where necessary and to accept Orthodox doctrine in its entirety. Palmer could not accept such a decision without demur because he was fully persuaded that Anglican faith was Orthodox and he tried to convince his hearers of it. Somewhat to their discomfiture he pointed out the changes that they had made in Dositheus' Confession of Faith, but it did not help. To Palmer's exposition of eucharistic doctrine, that the bread becomes the very Body of Christ spiritually and supernaturally without ceasing to be still physically, in the order of nature, bread, the Russian replied by affirming Transubstantiation. They upheld the number of the sacraments as seven, all of equal importance; were relentless on the *Filioque* where Palmer, while admitting that the addition was uncanonical, yet claimed the Greek Fathers as witnesses for its truth; would brook no criticism on the veneration of the Saints and their images.

Alexis Khomiakoff, in his long series of letters to Palmer, was equally unyielding in his presentation of the Orthodox position, though he gave to it a psychological nuance which at that time was peculiarly his own. "The gift of truth," he wrote, "is strictly separated from the hierarchical function (viz. from sacramental and disciplinary power,) and the essential distinction from the Roman notion is thus established; the gift of unvarying knowledge (which is nothing but faith) is attributed, not to individuals, but to the totality of the ecclesiastical body and is considered as a corollary of the moral principle of mutual love." Palmer did not agree with him, but Khomiakoff was satisfied that that was the fundamental reason why both the Roman and the Anglican Churches were outside of the Body of Christ, for they both had broken the bond of charity and mutual love. "Were you to find all truth" he wrote to Palmer, "you would have found nothing; for we alone can give you that without which all would be vain—the assurance of truth."

Palmer was the pioneer who inaugurated a whole new era of contact between the Russian and the Anglican Churches. His work was taken up by men like John Neale of Cambridge and George Williams in the middle of the 19th century, by men like W.J. Birkbeck and Athelstan Riley at the end of that century and the beginning of the next. Their enthusiasm inspired their Church. In October 1862 the Protestant Episcopal Church of America appointed a committee "to consider the expediency of communication with the Russo-Greek Church and to collect authentic information upon the subject" and the following year the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury set up a similar committee to communicate with the American Church "as to intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church." In the same

year (1863) representatives of four branches of the Anglican Church organized themselves into the Eastern Church Association whose aim was to enlighten the English-speaking public about the Eastern Churches and the Easterns about Anglicanism, and to promote friendly contacts. In 1868 the Holy Synod of Russia replied to a committee of American bishops seeking intercommunion that "the Eastern Church firmly adheres to the principles and convictions so clearly stated in the message sent in 1723 by the Orthodox Patriarchs of the East in reply to the Anglican bishops." In the same year the English Convocation resolved "to take steps towards opening direct negotiations with the Eastern Churches to achieve a practical form of intercommunion."

Such a rapid recital of some of the events of one decade indicates the keen and growing interest of Anglicanism in Russian Orthodoxy. It reached a kind of culmination in the years 1874-75. The definition of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council of 1870 had given rise to the Old Catholic movement whose leader, Dr. Dollinger, thought to unite all the forces opposed to the papacy in two conferences held at Bonn. Anglicans of England and of America, Russian and Greek Orthodox at the first conference of 1874 and the same Churches together with representatives of Rumania and Serbia at the second in 1875 discussed a variety of subjects and came to some general and vague agreements; but the Orthodox did not feel able to accept a resolution affirming the unbroken apostolic succession of the Anglican episcopate. The most important agreement, made at the second conference, concerned the *Filioque* clause. Anglicans admitted that it had not been added to the Creed "in an ecclesiastically regular manner" and both Anglicans and Greeks accepted the teaching of St. John Damascene on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, in a series of propositions which, being somewhat in the nature of a compromise, in the event received the wholehearted support of neither the Anglican nor the Russian Church. In England Dr. Pusey, the leader of the High Anglicans, attacked them strongly: in Russia the Holy Synod shelved them for further study with the result that these conferences were considered by later Anglican workers for union to have done more harm than good.

The Lambeth Conference of 1878 made no reference to relations with Orthodoxy, unless its repudiation of the practice of auricular confession can be construed as a reply to the approbation given to it in the first of the Bonn conferences. Lambeth 1888, however, "expressed its earnest desire to confirm and to improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion" and declared that "as standards of doctrine and worship alike we recognize the Prayer Book with its catechism, the Ordinal and the 39 Articles . . . We desire that these standards should be set before the foreign Churches in their purity and simplicity." This insistance on the 39 Articles was not calculated to facilitate rapprochement with the Russians who had always declared them the chief obstacle to intercommunion. But at this very moment an unexpected opportunity for a friendly gesture to that Church presented itself to the Anglican hierarchy. The Conference learnt from the British Embassy in Russia of the approaching centenary celebrations of Russian Christianity at Kiev. So a congratulatory letter was sent to the Metropolitan of Kiev to be delivered by Birkbeck, the correspondent in Russia of the paper, "The Guardian." That was the beginning of 30 years of assiduous endeavour on Birkbeck's part to bring the two Churches together, in the course of which he got to know the

Russian Church as no other Englishman did. By wise counsels, by conferences and newspaper articles he spread friendship for Russia in England and his knowledge of Russia and Russians and his intimacy with the Russian Church gained in return the goodwill of the Orthodox for Anglicanism.

The letter of congratulation bore unexpected fruit. Platon of Kiev replied by asking quite flatly: "I beg you to communicate to me clearly and definitely upon what conditions you consider the union of your and our Churches would be possible." The reply of Archbishop Benson of Canterbury, somewhat at a loss at so sudden and almost final a demand, was inevitably rather vague. "Two things," he said, "are essential to a real union. (1) First and above all, the drawing together of the hearts of the individuals composing the two Churches which would fain 'be at one together,'" which idea he later in his answer developed to mean the permission for individuals to communicate in each other's Churches, and (2) "Secondly, a more or less formal acceptance of each other's position with toleration for any points of difference, non-interference with each other upon any such points," which he later explained should cover acceptance of each other's Orders and, given time for serious consideration, general doctrine. It was an unfortunate reply, not only because of its vagueness, but chiefly because it showed that the Anglican approach to union was the direct opposite of that of the Russians. Benson suggested practical intercommunion and then unity of doctrine: the Russians could visualize intercommunion only as the consequence and fruit of unity of doctrine. The lesson was not lost upon Birkbeck who made sure that no such similar proposal should be repeated.

Birkbeck continued to labour hard to promote friendship for the Russian Church in England and for the English Church in Russia and soon became *persona grata* with the Russian Procurator General of the Holy Synod and even at the Russian court. When Bishop Creighton of Peterborough (later, of London) went to Russia to represent the Church of England at the coronation of Nicholas II (1896) and in the following year on the visit to Russia of Archbishop MacLagen of York, Birkbeck chaperoned those prelates on official visits to ecclesiastical dignitaries and religious ceremonies and everywhere they were received with honour. In the same year (1897) fell the Jubilee of Queen Victoria to which the Russian Church sent a representative in the person of Antonius, Archbishop of Finland, who, however, reminded his Anglican friends of the dependence of intercommunion upon unity of faith. In a letter of thanks for a set of Eucharistic vessels presented to him by members of the Church of England, he wrote that while using them he would ever remember the Anglican desire for unity: "This unanimity in the faith, which constitutes the essential condition for communion in the sacraments in general, is more particularly of absolute necessity for communion in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist."

The visit of the Archbishop of York, MacLagen, in 1897 had a certain added piquancy from the fact that it followed so shortly after the condemnation of Anglican Orders by Pope Leo XIII in 1896. Indeed as a prelude to that visit he had transmitted to the Russian Church a number of copies of the "Answer to the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*," that had appeared under the names of the two English Archbishops. Russian theologians in consequence, though feeling themselves in no way bound by the papal decision, were stimulated to study the question of Anglican Orders and several of their treatises were printed in the immediately following years. They were, on the

whole, not convinced by the Anglican reply and complained of the contradictions apparent between the Ordinal and the 39 Articles. The Anglican Church had never officially repudiated the Articles, however much individuals depreciated their value and importance, and, until it did so, or, at least, radically altered some of them, they could not see their way to acknowledging the validity of Anglican ordinations. The Lambeth Conference of 1897 could not go as far as that, especially as the Conference of 1888 had specifically included the Articles among its standards of doctrine. Instead it omitted any reference to them and asserted simply: "The Book of Common Prayer next to the Bible itself is the authoritative standard of doctrine of the Anglican Communion."

The same Conference of 1897 appointed the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London as a committee "to confer personally and by correspondence with the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs and the Holy Governing Synod of the Church of Russia with a view to considering the possibility of securing a clearer understanding and of establishing closer relations . . ." One result of this was the compilation of a statement of doctrine of the Anglican Church by Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury which was sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantine V, and appeared in Greek in the official organ of the Patriarchate in 1901. It would be too long to give here even a full resume of this work and the following points, as touching on the main controversies, must suffice. The Nicene, Apostolic and Athanasian Creeds, the Book of Common Prayer are standards of faith; the 39 Articles are rather articles of religion than a confession of faith, a sort of canon law; the Scriptures are the norm of every doctrine and also of tradition; ecumenical councils give "accurate and faithful expressions of the truth," to be tested by Scripture and acceptance by the body of the Church. Two sacraments are dominical and necessary for salvation; the other rites also give grace. "We believe and teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed given, taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper and that through this sacrament we dwell in Christ and Christ in us . . ." but we discourage scholastic definitions on how this comes about; the *Filioque* clause was introduced into the Creed in an irregular manner; Father, Son and Holy Spirit are co-eternal, the Spirit issuing from the Father through the Son.

This answer, nowhere very precise, found favour among many of the Greeks and encouraged Joachim III (1902), Constantine's successor, to circulate an Encyclical among the Orthodox Churches on the question of reunion with the West. The Holy Synod of Russia sent back a long reply (Feb. 23, 1903.) The Russian Church most ardently desires the return of all—Roman and Protestant—to the bosom of the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. It believes in the sincerity of their faith in the all-Holy and life-giving Trinity and on that account accepts as valid the baptism of both. Anglicans distinguish between the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches, accepting only the latter as the true conserver of the tradition of the Fathers. "It is indispensable that the desire for union with the Eastern Orthodox Church should become the sincere desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism (the "High Church,") but of the whole Anglican community, that the other, purely Calvinistic, current which rejects the essence of the Church as we understand it and shows itself violently intolerant of Orthodoxy, should be absorbed in the above-mentioned pure current and should lose its manifest, even perhaps exclusive, influence upon the Church policy and the whole Church life of this

Confession, which in the main is free from enmity towards us . . . the Eastern Orthodox Church which alone has preserved inviolate the complete deposit of faith, is alone at the present time the ecumenical Church." The Russian reply, therefore, was friendly but firm and in effect repeated the reply given to the Nonjurors in 1723 by the Eastern Patriarchs.

The answer of the Russian Synod did not apparently seem to the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to demand too much, for in the autumn of 1903 its Commission of Ecclesiastical Relations sent to Russia Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac, an enthusiast for the re-establishment of "Catholicism" in the American Branch of the Anglican Communion. He was accompanied by a deacon and the invaluable Mr. Birkbeck. His stay in Russia lasted five weeks (Sept. 12th—Oct. 21st) and in his varied visits and contacts he was everywhere well received by the Russian Church. In the name of the American Church he presented to Anthony of St. Petersburg and Ladoga, then President of the Holy Synod, a memorial containing points of agreement which he and his colleagues felt would warrant reunion, and points of diversity which they wished discussed. The memorial, with an occasional tilt at Catholicism when it was felt that such would please Orthodoxy and, in its treatment of the Eucharist, with some quotations from Aquinas to suggest a eucharistic doctrine common to Anglicanism and Rome, reads into Anglican formularies, including the Articles, doctrines harmonious with Russian Orthodoxy—about Orders, authority in the Church, the sacraments, invocation of the saints and the Trinity. But this *tour de force* would seem to have been without effect. At any rate, a special commission of the Holy Synod, set up at the request of Bishop Tykhon, Russian bishop in America (U.S.A.,) to examine the American Prayer Book, published its conclusions in 1904. The Book of Common Prayer, it said, though as it stood it did not directly contradict Orthodox teaching, yet owed this not so much to its orthodoxy as to its skillful manner of harmonising different tendencies. If an American community wished to be united with the Orthodox Church it could use this Prayer Book only if it cancelled all unorthodox words and added what was essential to the worship of God as practised in the Orthodox Church. The 39 Articles must be deleted. The Protestant teaching of the Catechism on the sacraments removed. The doctrine that the Holy Scriptures are the only source of Christian teaching must be relinquished. The liturgy, too, must be altered to harmonise with Orthodox doctrine on the Eucharist, and prayers to the Mother of God, the angels and saints be inserted. In the ordination rite an expression of belief in the divine appointment of the three orders of ministers and in priestly powers to perform the unbloody sacrifice must be included. Anglican clergy should be conditionally reordained on joining Orthodoxy.

This general description of the findings of the commission reflects the views of the Russian Church at that time. Bishop Tykhon himself went further. In 1905 he informed Bishop Tuttle, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, that he intended to ordain—and not merely conditionally—the Rev. I.R.W. Irvine who had for 30 years functioned as a minister of the American Church, on his conversion to Orthodoxy. And so he did, in spite of Bishop Tuttle's remonstrance that: "It seems to me that it would be a public expression on your part of a repudiation of the validity of the Orders of our Church, and might be a serious interruption to the current of amity and unity now setting in between the two Churches." Bishop

Tykhon, however, was not unmoved by what he saw of American interest in his own Church and was an active member of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union founded in 1906. This union had a parallel association also in Russia which held its first meeting in 1912 in the official residence of the Procurator General of the Holy Synod and determined to invite members of other communions to Russia to lecture on ecclesiastical history. The first recipient of such an invitation was Rev. F.W. Puller of the Cowley Fathers who in four lectures outlined English Church history from the VI century to modern times with a view to proving to his auditors "the legal and spiritual continuity of the Church of England before and after its reform."

A little before this, however, there were sown the first seeds of that ecumenism which later developed into the World Council of Churches. In Edinburgh in 1910 there took place the first world Missionary Conference and that gave rise in America to what later went by the name of the Faith and Order Movement which is now one of the constituent parts of the World Council of Churches. In October 1910 the General Convention of the American Protestant Episcopal Church appointed a committee to arrange a world-wide convention of the Churches for the consideration of questions of faith and order. A letter was sent by its secretary, Mr. Robert Gardiner, also to all the prelates of the Russian Church. Some interest was aroused and Archbishop Platon of the Orthodox Russian Church of America agreed in 1914 to transmit all the relevant documents to the Holy Synod. Antony, Archbishop of Kharkov, had a long correspondence with Gardiner on the project, pointing out that "The efforts of the two Churches (Anglican and Russian) over half-a-century were not infected with religious fanaticism, and yet they had always failed." The reason he gave for that was a fundamental disagreement on the dogma of the Church and he came back to the basic Russian position that only the Orthodox Church is the Church of Christ, and that outside of that there is no life of grace, no episcopacy, no clergy, no sacraments. Even so, Archbishop Antony appointed a delegate to attend the conference but the political events of 1914 stopped any further development at that time.

The war of 1914 was the prelude in Russia to the fall of the monarchy and the advent to power of Bolshevism. But between these two events, while there still seemed to be hope of a democratically elected assembly to rule a republican Russia, the Russian Church had time to undo the reforms of Peter the Great by electing for itself a Patriarch and establishing the outline of a constitution. The new Patriarch, the first for two centuries and more, was Tykhon, for some 10 years Bishop, then Archbishop, of the Russians in America, later (1907) Archbishop of Yaroslav, then (1913) of Lithuania and Vilna and from early in 1917 of Moscow. He had been in close relations with the Episcopal Church of America and was a member of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. On September 11, 1917 the Archbishop of Canterbury had telegraphed in the name of the Church of England good wishes and the assurance of prayers to the Pan-Russian council which had begun its sessions in the previous August. No reply was forthcoming for three months, but when it did come on December 14, 1917 (Archbishop Tykhon had been elected Patriarch in November) it was entirely satisfactory. It consisted of the text of a resolution of the Pan-Russian Council to the following effect: "Steps shall be taken to enter into relations with the Episcopal Churches of England and America, to lead to closer relations between these Churches and the Russian Church." Three days later Canterbury sent a telegram of

congratulation to the new Patriarch which contained the phrase: "It is towards the Christian Church, united throughout the world in the bonds of our holy faith, that the human race must look in hours of darkness and confusion, to obtain light and salvation." This message received from the Patriarch a reply of thanks and hope that, in face of the anti-Christian spirit everywhere prevalent "may all Christians be united in an energetic fight for the glorious standard of our faith, the Holy Cross of Our Saviour. We rejoice to know that the Church of England holds the Russian Church near to its heart," after which words followed the phrase quoted above from the English message, repeated verbatim by the head of the Russian Church. It was the first time that Russia had spoken of "our faith" as a common possession of its and the English Church. It seemed to augur well for the future, but the future in Russia was to be dominated by atheism and Archbishop Tykhon himself to suffer gloriously for the Church of which he was the head.

The Russian Church in the years following the Bolshevik revolution was despoiled and persecuted and, apart from a visit of the Anglican Bishop Bury to Archbishop Tykhon in the short period between his release from prison and his death (1925,) no direct contact with it was possible till after it emerged into a new phase of existence through the Constitution of 1946. Meanwhile the exiled Russians had developed various schisms among themselves, according as they owed allegiance to Moscow, to the Synod of Karlovtsky or the Ecumenical Patriarch. Anglo-Russian relations have proved to be easiest with the last of these groups whose centre is in Paris. Under the auspices and with the financial aid of the American Y.M.C.A., a "Christian Movement of Russian Students" was formed with its own periodical, which holds annual congresses. In Paris, too, a Russian theological Institute or Academy was founded in 1925 for the preservation of the Russian theological tradition and for devising new means to reach the masses devastated by Communism. It is largely supported by American and English money and, in latter years, has been given a home also in the States, a wing of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Russian theology has been represented at the international Conferences of Faith and Order etc. and of the World Council of Churches by theologians from Paris (i. e. of the Constantinopolitan allegiance) who at Lausanne and Edinburgh signed with the other Orthodox delegates the statement disassociating themselves from the official Report. The Synod of Karlovtsky, however, has several times refused to take any part in the international Church movements. America and England have given further steady support to the Paris group by paying for the education of Russian students in their universities and theological colleges, one of the consequences of which has been the formation of the "Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius" to promote mutual friendly relations. This association with its seat in London holds annual conferences and produces a periodical, "Sobornost."

The emergence into public life, however, of the Orthodox Church in Russia after 1946 made official relations with it once more possible. The Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a letter of congratulation to the Patriarch of Moscow for the centenary celebrations held there in 1948 and in the same year there was further correspondence between them, as the Patriarch had misunderstood Canterbury's invitation that Russia should send a representative to the Lambeth Conference to mean that such a delegate would take part in the business of the Conference. Neither Canterbury nor Moscow wanted that,

but it took several letters each way to make that clear and in the end no representative was sent. Indeed in the light of future events none could very well have been sent for the Moscow celebrations developed into a sort of Pan-Orthodox conference (though Constantinople and Greece kept clear of that part) which passed resolutions that were a disappointment both to the Anglican Church and to the World Council of Churches.

An invitation to send delegates to the Assembly at Amsterdam had been officially transmitted to the Church of Russia and for a time it looked as if it would be accepted. In the event no representative was sent. Instead the whole idea of the World Council of Churches was discussed at the Conference held in Moscow about a month before the Amsterdam Assembly was due to open, and there condemned. The Resolutions of the Moscow Conference declared that the World Council of Churches ultimately was aiming at an "Ecumenical Church" foreign in ideal and duties to the Church as founded by Christ. It had, in fact, despaired of ever actualising the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and, as a line of least resistance, was seeking an abstract union on an economic-social plane, which was nothing but political and deprived of the ways and means of grace. In view of which the Conference of Heads and representatives of autocephalous Orthodox Churches resolved: "That it be made known to the World Council of Churches, in reply to the invitation received by each of us to participate, in the capacity of members, in the Congress at Amsterdam, that all the local Orthodox Churches taking part in this present Council find themselves obliged to refuse to participate in the Ecumenical Movement in its present form." This resolution was communicated to the World Council of Churches by a letter which also requested that no one, even if a Russian and an Orthodox belonging to one of the groups of Russian Orthodox not under the jurisdiction of Moscow, should be called a representative of the Russian Orthodox Church. The letter added: "This refusal on our part does not, however, mean that we shall have no interest in the activities of the Ecumenical Movement. The Russian Orthodox Church, besides, has not lost confidence in the possibility of reunion in grace with her, by God's help, of any Christian confession or body. She is ready to have direct connection with them with the object of their reunion, without turning to the World Council of Churches as intermediary.

"In view of this, we would ask you to keep us informed regarding the activities of the World Council of Churches, sending to us suitable literature, reports on the assemblies and conferences, papers on all questions, and so forth."

Anglican Orders were also discussed at the Conference at Moscow. The text of the resolution on this subject notes that the 39 Articles differ considerably in doctrine from the Orthodox faith, whereas for recognition of Anglican Orders unity of faith, especially as regards the sacraments in general and the sacrament of Orders in particular, is essential. For this the views of individuals ready to modify the teaching of the Articles will not suffice. There is needed "an authoritative act of the Anglican Church being made on this subject and proceeding from a council or congress of the clergy of the Anglican Communion with subsequent confirmation of this by the head of the Anglican Church: such an act does not yet exist. In this connection we express the desire that the Anglican Church should alter its teaching of faith from the dogmatic, canonical and ecclesiological point of view . . . If such a unity of faith between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches were formally expressed, Angli-

can Orders could be recognized on the principle of economy but only by a council of the whole Orthodox Church."

The Catholic Church, too, was, of course, discussed at Moscow and roundly condemned, but that is outside the scope of this article, except in so far as it enters into the Conference's "Appeal for Unity" addressed to all the Christians of the world. In that the Conference recapitulated the conclusions it had arrived at elsewhere. True unity, it was said, cannot come through the Catholic Church because she is political rather than ecclesiastical. Nor can it be gained through Anglicanism which "not having a sacrament of Orders, does not give sufficient importance to the apostolic succession, to that single source of sanctification and unity of the Church in time. She dogmatizes the union of Church and State and does not understand the unity of the Church as the unity of belief." It cannot come through the World Council of Churches which "has replaced the aim of interior and organic unity supported by dogmas by an exterior, mechanical union, based on the struggle against social and economic injustice and also on the struggle with the Roman Church;" so that "it mixes in international politics and becomes the instrument of political plans directed against those who confess the Orthodox faith." "There is only one true road which leads to the re-establishment of the true unity of the Church . . .," which the Orthodox Church alone has preserved.

Whatever may be thought of Moscow's judgements on the Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement, on Anglicanism at least it must be held to be consistent with the Orthodox attitude of the past. Amendment of the 39 Articles, acceptance of the Orthodox faith, an official statement from the whole Anglican body, the Orthodox Church constituting at present the Church of Christ—these have been the basic requirements demanded of Anglican enquirers from the time of the Nonjurors, on through the XIX century, and are repeated from Moscow again today.

J. Gill, S.J.

Fernand Portal and Portalism

A TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

June 19, 1951 marked the 25th anniversary of Fernand Portal's death. He was born at La Roque (Herault) in 1855, was a priest of the Mission (Lazarists,) and died at Paris on Rue de Lourmel. His obsequies took place on June 25, 1926 at the chapel of the Lazarists, 96, Rue de Sevres. He was given a temporary sepulture at the cemetery of Montparnasse. A year later, his remains were transferred to Corbieres, in the commune of Pugny-Chatenod on the slopes of Mount Revard, in the crypt of the shrine built by his pious collaborator, Mme. Gallice. When she died in 1932, she was also buried in that crypt, and there her tomb stands close to that of the magnanimous priest who had inspired her labors.

The church is built in the form of the Greek cross. Like the Cathedral of Diakovo, built by Strossmayer, the apostle of the Slavs, it is dedicated to Church Unity, and that holy aspiration is expressed in the designs of the sumptuous decorations. From the height of the stately belvedere, a vast panorama spreads out, embracing a majestic amphitheater of snowcapped mountains, whose valleys lead beyond the horizon, one to Chambery, another to Annecy, and another to Lyons. Below lies the prosperous town of Aix-les-Bains, dear to Queen Victoria, and the *Lac* sung by Lamartine. On the far slope is the Abbey of Hautecombe, another center of prayers for Unity, where the Cistercian monks, by day and by night, solemnly perform the holy cycle of the "laus perennis."

Abbe Hemmer, the eminent historian, whose sound judgment no one doubts, and whose orthodoxy has never been questioned, wrote a line about him that makes one's head swirl: *"Perhaps we should say of Fr. Portal that he has changed something in the religious atmosphere of the world."*

His influence exceeds by far the importance of his writings. The works that flowed from his pen are not voluminous. It is his irenic spirit, a trend of thought which we now know as *Portalism*, that made its mark on religious history.

Portalism is not a system, nor is it a preconceived method. It is rather a kind of generous and enterprising optimism in unionistic matters. This optimism reveals itself in different ways in the multiple circumstances and problems. We might best evoke it by citing some of the more frequently repeated maxims:

1. One must think and live in the perspective of the *total Body of Christ*: this implies an enlargement and enrichment of the tract *De Ecclesia,* of which the old text books hardly present anything but the juridical and statistical aspects.[1]

2. *One must seek to understand one's adversaries*, never treat them as such, no matter how much they seem to be that, and find the way of making friends of them.

3. The first thing to do is to *become acquainted.* Centuries of separation have broken Christianity into many fragments. We no longer combat, or very rarely do, but we still do not know one another. We behave as if the

1) After the encyclicals *Mystici Corporis* and *Humani Generis* it has become evident that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Church are one and the same thing.

dissidents were not our *brothers* in a certain real although incomplete sense. To know one another, we must come closer to each other. *Something can be done.* Since the cause is well worth the trouble, since the salvation of many depends upon it, it is a very grave duty to do all that it is possible to do.

Becoming acquainted does not mean merely that we should study the origin of the heresies and schisms. The Churches have evolved, the theologians' positions have altered, there is new literature. These works are to be read. Albert Gratieux says of Fr. Portal, "Being familiar with all the modern effort of thought, he knew that positive theology should neglect nothing of the great German and English works, and he encouraged young scholars to study modern languages thoroughly." It was he who oriented the Russian vocations of Anthony Martel and Abbe Gustave Morel.

Furthermore, the outstanding personalities and the hierarchical heads should be frequented. One must talk.

Fernand Portal was a man of personal acquaintances and direct contact. His friendship with Lord Halifax, president of the *English Church Union,* oriented him in this direction, and gave him easy access to the Anglican authorities that he could hardly have hoped for.

4. Encounters between various confessions and mixed conferences should be promoted. Study clubs should be established in which representatives of the most divergent beliefs—Catholics, Anglicans, and agnostics—would come to exchange their ideas, their views, and their newspapers. Example: the *Cercle d'Etudes* of the Seminary of St. Vincent de Paul, rue de Cherche-Midi (Paris.)

5. Very few, if any individual conversions.[2]

6. One should work with the idea of corporate reunion in mind.

7. Unity is a work which must be considered with a long period in mind; it will require the work of many generations. We must *not permit ourselves to be discouraged by setbacks,* but should ceaselessly recommence the work which, scarcely begun, is undone like Penelope's tapestry.

Portal's faculty of recovering from failure was prodigious. His dealings between the Holy See and the Anglican Archbishops in 1894 are an example. He had played an important role as liaison agent between Rome and Canterbury. He had been received in audience by Leo XIII on September 12, 1894. That day he thought he was at the point of obtaining a private and secret letter from the Pope to the Archbishops of York and Canterbury which would invite them to work with him on the problem of Church Unity. Two or three days later his jubilant hopes were dashed to the ground.

Cardinal Rampolla notified him as follows:

"The Pope thinks that the way is not yet sufficiently prepared for the letter you suggested, but that some indirect approach would be better as a beginning. I shall write you a letter which you will deliver to Lord Halifax, and this letter will contain much of what you outlined for the letter to the Archbishops."

What had happened? Leo XIII had consulted the Rector of the Scotch College at Rome. The latter declared that it would be easier to reunite the

2) It is the mind of *Unitas* that unionistic work should not hinder individual conversions (Cf. C. Boyer, *Ecumenism and Conversions, Unitas* Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 4-10.) As for corporate reunion, it must be recognized that such a type of reunion is not possible with the Church of England; not least among the reasons is the fact that the Anglican community is too divided within itself.

Scotch Presbyterians than the Anglicans for the reason that they are not bound by any dependence upon the state authorities.

Lord Halifax, accompanied by Abbe Portal, presented the letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury who was grieved at not finding the signature of the Holy Father. He added that the message contained certain expressions that an Archbishop of Canterbury could not accept, as for instance, the implication that Rome was the Mother and Mistress of all the Churches. He added that papal infallibility was a great obstacle, but not the only one.

His reply was a bitter disappointment to Lord Halifax and the Abbe Portal.

Others would have been discouraged by such a failure along with the barrage of criticisms that assailed him. Fernand Portal remained faithful to his cause.

A young man will easily admit in theory that Christian unity will take a very long time, but he nourishes a secret hope that one day he will see it realized. What tries him, and tests the mettle of his faith is resistance to frustrations. Fernand Portal's staunchness was exemplary.

In 1894 he began to project a review entitled *Union des Eglises.* It finally made its appearance, but under the title of *La Revue Anglo-Romaine.* 51 numbers succeeded one another from 1895 to the end of 1896. After the promulgation of the encyclical *Satis cognitum* (June 29, 1896,) the information was given him from Rome that the Pope did not approve his apostolate. Cardinal Perraud wrote to the Archbishop of Paris, "The Pope has told me that he disapproves of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* which is published at Paris by Leve. This review is too much in the hands of Lord Halifax and the Anglicans, and they are wont to deal on a basis of equality, instead of simply humbling themselves. I have been charged to advise you of these sentiments." On July 26, Abbe Portal met Lord Halifax at Mont-Dore, and confided to him that he had been told to abstain in the future from all dealings in English religious affairs.

In announcing the suspension of publication, the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* stated a law of Portalism that our hero knew how to observe without murmur—at times with exceptional merit:

"Today the prevailing perturbation of mind seems to require a period of repose and pacification. Invincibly attached to all the teachings of the holy and apostolic See, the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* has received in *full submission of spirit and heart* the two recent constitutions of the Holy Father on Church Unity and on Anglican ordinations. It hopes that all separated brethren who have encouraged it with their sympathy will accept them along with it."

The collection of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* makes up three large volumes of 800 pages.

On January 25, 1904, Fernand Portal launched the *Revue Catholique des Eglises.* It had a life-span of five years. (The entire collection comprises five volumes of 600 pages.) It fell, along with the *Cercle d'Etudes,* in the wake of the antimodernist reaction. Yet no precise declaration was ever made on just what this periodical taught that merited condemnation. Abbe Portal retired from the university seminary of St. Vincent de Paul. He knew how to disappear with dignity and await his hour.

His hour came with the *Conversations of Malines.* After the first meeting, Lord Halifax, carried away with enthusiasm, wrote him, ". . . after God, it is you, you, you, who have done all." (December 23, 1921.)

Fernand Portal replied:

"Is it possible that we are really at the dawn of a new era? Everything favors this trust; we can only thank God for his goodness in using us to knot together the threads which had been so brutally severed. Our old friendship surely stands in no need of recompense, but that it should please God to add this joy is really good, and it makes of it something more beautiful and more precious."

In the autumn of 1925, during the week of Unity organized by the Benedictines of Amay-sur-Meuse, he gave a conference which has come to be thought of as his spiritual legacy. It is entitled, *The Role of Friendship in Church Unity.*[3]

His exordium runs thus:

"We have come, Lord Halifax and I, to give our testimony of sympathy to the work that the Belgian Benedictines are taking up with such great faith and such admirable courage. As old workers in the field of Church Unity who must before long pass the torch to others, it seemed to us that we owed some such manifestation to these new workers who come inspired with that spirit of peace and charity which all apostles of Unity ought to have."

All was ready for the Fifth Conversation of Malines when Cardinal Mercier died (January 23, 1926.) Abbe Portal was soon to follow him. Towards the end of April he suffered a serious liver attack. Reviewing his career as pioneer of Unity, he thanked God for a vocation that accorded so well with his desires. In his humility, and in the wisdom of his experience, he reproached himself for his shortcomings. In May he confided to the Abbe Calvet, "In this question of Unity, what I had dreamed has been realized. I had wished rapprochement; they have come together, and they are talking. That which was my work has come to an end. Now I need only disappear. To proceed further, other means are needed which I do not know. Now other men are needed, men who are fresh and not worn. I would not be of use; I would merely be in the way."

His task was that of a precursor, his duty was to sound the note of optimism. Through the clouds of difficulties, blame, and trials he clung unflinchingly to the idea that "reunion" is not an utopian dream, in spite of all obstacles, both ancient and new, and because of him that idea has triumphed and prevailed. As Hemmer said, he had *changed something in the religious atmosphere of the world.* He was ready then to disappear for the last time with that same elegant gesture that had always distinguished his effacements. He could die and make of his death a supreme sacrifice to his life's ideal.

DAVID LATHOUD

3) Cf. *Documentation Catholique,* 8th year, T. XX, Feb. 13, 1926, col. 401-411.

Position of the Russian Church in the U.S.S.R.

ANYONE WHO wishes to form an idea of the spirit which prevails in the official Russian Church under the "jurisdiction of Moscow" has only to look through a number of the Russian monthly review, *Journall Moskovskoi Patriarkhii,* published at Moscow by the clergy in the entourage of the Patriarch Alexis. We have selected a typical issue, No. 9 of 1949, for analysis.

On the first page a telegram is published in which the Archbishop of Albania, Paise, announces his election as Bishop of Tirana to the Patriarch Alexis. The message is brief, 11 lines in all:

"In informing you of our election . . ., we promise and assure you that our Church, with the help of God and the Powers of the Nation, by our will and with the personal support of Your Holiness . . . will apply the pacifying principles of the Gospel while maintaining herself in the ranks of the invincible democratic and anti-imperialistic party and fighting for a just and lasting peace . . . Your Nation is at the head of the camp of opposition to the imperialistic incendiaries who are making ready a new effusion of blood and a new catastrophe."

In his response (on the next page) the Patriarch of Moscow rejoices that the two churches of the U.S.S.R. and of Albania are inspired by the same spirit of "the fight for peace in the whole world."

The official administrative announcements, nominations, etc. follow. We learn, among other things, that the Archbishop of Kazan, Hermogenes, has received from the Patriarch the title of Doctor *honoris causa* in recompense for his "scientific and polemical works." We will see later what kind of "works" are meant.

There follows a detailed description of the religious solemnities which had recently taken place in the *laura* of St. Sergius, near Moscow (pp. 7-11.)

The discourse of the Metropolitan, Nicholas of Kroutitsy, at the Congress of the "Partisans of Peace" which took place at Moscow is reproduced in full (pp. 12-17.) It is a list of enthusiastic and extravagant praises addressed to the Bolshevist regime, and of invectives against the "international brigands" (now in Russia everyone should fight against "cosmopolitanism,") the "shrieking sirens," the "man-eating gluttons," the "cynical and sadistic beings," the "adorers of the calf of gold," the "octopus of the ocean," and the "prostitute." The Metropolitan continues:

"The Russian Orthodox Church, which looks lovingly upon the faithful masses of the Catholic Church, cannot pass over in silence the activity of a handful of men who, in that Church, have usurped power and rights and who, both in theory and practice, inspire the military hysteria of our age. During the entire second World War never a word was heard from the Papal See in protestation against the executioners of humanity in favor of the killed and tortured . . . This voice resounded only once: when the assassins were judged. The voice resounded in favor of the assassins! Today, the head of the Catholic Church, blinded by his ancient hatred of Orthodoxy and above all towards the Slavs and, among them, in particular towards the men of the Russian Soviet, this sworn enemy of the Soviet Union has openly entered into the sinister camp of those pouring oil upon a new conflagration . . . The Pope of Rome showed his anti-Christian outlook in all its spiritual ugliness a short time ago when his decree appeared excommunicating Communists and all those who sympathize with them. This decree is in radical contradiction with

the foundations of evangelical Christian doctrine. It has seen the light thanks to the bestial hatred of the head of the Roman Catholic Church . . . No, not only will the Russian Orthodox Church not bless the swords of the new conquering invaders, not only will it not go against the most just of governments which it has had during the long and complex history of its country, but it declares . . . absolutely and openly that the enterprises which are truly humanitarian, noble, and envisage only the welfare of the workers and fraternal charity will be entirely supported by the Orthodox Church . . . The Russian Orthodox Church believes it her duty to unmask from the height of this tribune these wolves in sheep's clothing who hide under high Christian titles and to show the great masses of simple faithful of all Christian confessions of the entire world into what an abyss of moral savagery, and spiritual and physical ruin their 'spiritual' directors are impelling them . . ."

It is not difficult to see in this discourse the plan of those who inspired it. While repeating to satiety the monstrous calumny that the Holy Father wants war and takes the side of the capitalists against the workers, they are trying to detach from Rome as many Catholics as possible and to facilitate the victory of atheism over the Catholic Church and all Christianity.

After the discourse of the red Metropolitan, the review gives us a long article signed, "A. Ch." (pp. 18-29) and entitled, "For the Defense of Peace." It is an extremely flattering and detailed description of the Congress of Peace held at Moscow in August, 1949. Of course, the inevitable Bolshevistic attacks against the Vatican have the place of honor. The author makes his own the words of the Italian Socialist leader, Nenni: "The Vatican has recommenced its activity to resuscitate, as in the worst days of Nazism, the atmosphere of an anti-Soviet and anti-Socialist crusade." The author finds that the anti-Communist politics of the American Government are "the perfect carrying out of Pope Pius XII's decree of July 13, 1949"—the decree excommunicating Communists.

"This decree of the Vatican can be called the message of a very deep rupture between the princes of the Catholic Church and the simple clergy and faithful. The preachers of Christian doctrine cannot hold themselves to the strict sense of Gospel and Apostolic teaching if they rise against the democratic masses and employ their power and influence to safeguard the privileges and rights of the few owners of vast material riches in capitalistic countries."

The author then ennumerates the high personages of the ecclesiastical world who took part in the Congress at Moscow, without forgetting the famous Anglican, Dean Johnson, and a defrocked Czechoslovak. He adduces once again long citations from the discourse of the Metropolitan Nicholas about which we have just spoken. He also gives a description of the Communist Congresses of Peace which took place in different regions of the U.S.S.R. and abroad and announces other congresses of the same kind.

After this article there follows a sermon by Metropolitan Nicholas on penitence (pp. 30-33.) The Russian Chrysostom—so he is called at Moscow—speaks about charity, good-will, and fraternal love. It is truly painful to read this sermon when one thinks of the hate which this unhappy prelate has always manifested toward the Catholic clergy and of the revolting calumnies which he spreads in order to please the atheists: for example, that the Uniate priest, Kostelnyk, who went over to the schism of Galicia, was assassinated by order of the Vatican.

The review also publishes a theological article by the Bishop Isidore

(pp. 34-37) entirely dedicated to a "refutation" of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Everything which is anti-Catholic is always pleasing to the Kremlin. The author defends the strange theory that sanctifying grace is perfectly reconcilable with original sin. "Before the passion of Christ the Apostles had in them the Spirit of God; nevertheless, original sin remained in them." At the same time the Blessed Virgin Mary would have been filled with grace long before she was free of original sin.

A certain A. Bouievsky speaks at length about the Congress of dissident prelates who gathered at Moscow in the summer of 1948. The author evidently finds perfectly right everything which was said against the Vatican by the dignitaries of the Oriental Churches. He states with satisfaction that the Catholics of the association of "Christian Progressives" approve the appeals for peace made by the Patriarchal See of Moscow—as though the appeals of the Holy See had not been even more cogent and better founded. Our author also shows much sympathy toward the Anglican Church. What he says about the reactions in the Protestant world on the occasion of the Council of Moscow is insignificant, but one feels in it a vague desire of union with all those who oppose the unification of Christianity by Rome.

The article of the Archbishop Hermogenes (pp. 43-51) treats about the "activity of the Vatican during the last 20 years." It is a hateful fabric of the basest Communist calumnies against the Holy See and the Catholic Church in general. The author opens by proclaiming that the "essence of the Roman Curia's politics is expressed in the well known principle: 'the end justifies the means'." Hermogenes builds up "arguments" against the Vatican with so much passion that he fails to notice how his arguments destroy each other. Because of a reactionary spirit Pius XI backed the "popolari" of Italy and. . . suppressed the party of the same "popolari." Pius XI is described as a fanatic of Italian expansion, preaching the Abyssinian War; again it is insinuated that he was an enemy of his country. The author interprets the concordats with Mussolini and with Hitler's Reich as marks of a deep and exclusive friendship with the "fascists." There is not a word about the long struggle that the Vatican and the whole of Catholicism had led against Nazi ideology, and not a word about the different concordats of the Holy See with countries and governments which had nothing to do with Hitler. Nor is there any word about the bombs dropped from a Fascist airplane on the Vatican. There is scarcely anything about the cruel persecutions which the Catholic Church and in particular the institutions most closely attached to the Holy See had to suffer at the hands of the Hitlerites. Only once does the author mention that the picture of the Pope was burned by the Fascists and that Hitler closed the Catholic schools. But even in these events Hermogenes succeeds in finding proof of Pius XI's friendship for Hitlerism!

Still more violent are the attacks of the red prelate against Pius XII. All the crudities used by the anti-clerical press in the U.S.S.R. and abroad to compromise the Pope is condensed in the Hermogenes' article. The Holy Father is pictured at one and the same time as having been unreservedly devoted to Hitler and as being the agent of American imperialism. Hermogenes calumniates the Holy Father with a passion and unscrupulosity which borders on insanity. The following passage gives one an idea:

"The Slavs of Albania, Croatia, Serbia, and the U.S.S.R. were bestially tortured and destroyed by the Germans with the direct support of the Vatican. During the two world wars several million Slavs were killed or

wounded. It is terrifying to think that this colossal destruction of Slavs was done by virtue of the Roman Pontiff's blessing and supposedly for the glory of the Roman Catholic Church. But the hearts of the simple Christian believers are filled with an ever greater horror when they see Pius XII's efforts to maintain the present-day agressive politics of the Anglo-Americans . . . Pius XI and Pius XII are responsible for the blood of millions of Slavs killed and tortured—innocent victims of fascism and the Vatican."

What is interesting in this article of Archbishop Hermogenes is the sources from which he draws his information on Catholicism. He does not hide them. Apart from some rather harmless passages, almost the whole of the injurious gossip and demogogic calumnies of which the article is made up are copied, without the least criticism, from the book of comrade M. Scheinman, *The Vatican Between Two World Wars.*[1] Who is this M. (Moses?) Scheinman? He is very probably the M. Scheinman who wrote many anti-religious and anti-Catholic books published before the last war by the Association of Militant Atheists. He was a very active member of this Association and an implacable atheist. Moreover, in the book of this author, where the Communist prelate found his information, the principal grievance and determinant of Scheinman against the Papacy, is succinctly stated and repeated many times: the Pope is the enemy of *atheism* (p. 130;) the Pope dares to preach *"the return to religion"* (p. 139;) the Pope encourages the struggle against *materialism* (p. 199;) the Pope has pronounced against Communism, against *atheism*, against a *materialistic philosophy* (p. 218.) Naturally, Archbishop Hermogenes omits all that—it is really too compromising. It is as instructive as it is consoling to learn that the impious calumniate and persecute the Church because she remains faithful to the fundamental principles of religion and refuses to become a docile instrument of militant impiety!

The next article (pp. 52-57,) written by a certain Alexander Volkov, speaks about "the Vatican's abandonment of the foundations of Christianity." In the first part of the article, the author relates, in his own way, the social teaching of the Catholic Church: the sanction of capitalism, of slavery, of the "absolute" right of private property, etc. On this occasion St. Thomas Aquinas is rather badly treated. The whole first part of the article is borrowed from the same Scheinman, the inspirer of *Bezbojnik*. The rest of the article is made up of quotations from St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom. What do these texts say? That God is the true Master of all goods; that private property must not be abused; that the common good must be taken into account; that the wretchedness of the poor must be relieved. But all this is authentic Catholic doctrine. But our author, with his Marxist logic, concludes from them that the Fathers were against all private property, that they were Communists. Volkov finds that the Catholic doctrine is "pagan;" it is based on the natural law.

The last article (pp. 58-63) is of the historical order with a demogogical slant. The author contrives to make the Popes responsible for what Russia has suffered at the hands of its Western neighbours. It is moreover the accepted thing in the dissident world to attribute to the imagined orders or instigations of the Holy See all the faults and crimes committed even by those who are Catholic in name only.

How is this strange and distressing phenomenon to be explained: Chris-

1) 1948, edition of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

tian priests and bishops constantly and in unison making absurd accusations, enormous lies, and revolting calumnies against the Catholic Church? Why have they coupled themselves with the most shameless enemies of religion?

To say that all these prelates have sold their conscience for the mess of porridge of a comfortable life in an atheistic state would be simplifying the problem too much. When in view of the difficulty of their situation, these prelates are more to be pitied than to be blamed. Let us leave it to God to judge their consciences, and turn our attention rather toward certain historical and psychological factors which have largely contributed to building up the hostile attitude of Russian Christians toward Rome.

Is the enigma to be explained by the fact that during the last World War Catholics nations took part in the invasion of Russia ? This explanation is not altogether in conformity with the facts; it is only true in part. The main armies of Hitler were composed principally of Protestants and no aversion to Protestantism has arisen in the U.S.S.R. The monstrous cruelties were committed—as everyone in Russia knows—by the Nazis, sworn enemies of Catholicism. The Russians complained greatly of the excesses committed by the Roumanian soldiers, and are incomparably more bitter against them than they are to the Italians. But 90 percent of the Roumanians are "orthodox," at least in name. Poland, the great Catholic cousin of Russia, far from being an ally of Hitler, was his first major victim. More exactly, this country was the victim of the Hitler-Stalin friendship. On the other hand, among the allies of Soviet Russia there was France (reputed to be Catholic,) 26,000,000 Catholics of the United States, half of the population of Canada, etc. When Hitler occupied the Ukraine and White Russia, he opened those churches for worship which had been closed by the very ones who today are the object of admiration for the Russian clergy in the U.S.S.R. Hitler protected the dissident Church and showed himself openly hostile to all Catholic action in Russia. The several dozen Catholic chaplains tolerated by Hitler in the German or Italian regiments left a better impression, in general, in the country than the much more numerous pro-Hitler Russian ecclesiastics. The conduct of the Catholic priests contrasted strikingly with the arrogant attitude of the fanatically anti-Roman Nazis who protected the Ukrainian Church.

The aversion of the Russians, especially of the clergy, to Catholicism has, alas, much more profound and more complex historical roots. We need not go back to the time of the Crusades when "Catholics" pillaged and profaned Greek sanctuaries; there is the memory of the invasions against which Alexander Nevsky fought and especially those of the "Epoch of Troubles" (end of the XVI and beginning of the XVII century) when bands of "Catholics," profiting by the general disorder, ravaged Russia committing murders and outraging the most legitimate and sacred sensibilities of the people. Let us not forget either that at this same period the Catholic Church seemed to the Russians to be closely allied with the famous False Dmitri, that mysterious personage who usurped the throne of the Czars with the help of the "Catholics" and brought upon himself the reprobation of all for his scorn of traditional Russian piety. And in the Ukraine which was conquered by Poland, it can hardly be said that the "Catholic" lords always behaved as Catholics or at least as just masters. It was by no means the case. One need only reflect upon the unbelievable humiliations that the dissident clergy, or even the united clergy, had to suffer at the hands of the "Latins" who treated the "faith of the

moujiks," their slaves, with sovereign scorn. It happened at times that the lord of a place rented a village church to a Jew who entered the sanctuary as master and required the payment of considerable sums for each religious function that he permitted to be celebrated there. The Popes had nothing to do with these revolting abuses, but the reputation of Catholicism was compromised for centuries.

Another factor in the implanting of anti-Catholic and anti-Roman prejudices is the fact that for centuries the Catholics have not had the freedom in Russia to defend the Catholic Church against false accusations, calumnies, and theological attacks: the government made all Catholic apologetics practically impossible. Objections, the distortion of events, calumnious interpretations, and theological objections accumulated, multiplied, and grew without meeting any refutation and thus became "crushing arguments" against Catholicism. An example: some Russian theologians (e. g. Malinovshy) state as an absolutely incontestable fact that one of the principal ceremonies at the coronation of the Pope consists in the newly elected Pontiff's ascending upon the altar of the Church of St. Peter and sitting in the middle of it immediately right at the place where the Host is consecrated. The "Jesuits of Religious Order whatsoever" were not admitted into Russia, and in all the ecclesiastical schools they had to be judged according to the . . . *Monita secreta.* The pamphlets of different apostate or defrocked priests and western anticlerical writings circulated throughout the country, while the least refutation on the part of Catholics was called "illegal propaganda" and severely punished. In our days in the U.S.S.R. Catholic apologetics are still more drastically suppressed. Herein lies one of the principal reasons why the breach between the Catholics and the dissidents is so deep and broad.

It is necessary also to take account of a trait of the Russian character. A Russian does not like half-measures, diplomatic methods, mediocrity, gradual processes. He is "maximist" and radical. He drives straight to the point, and goes the whole way. It is a precious quality, but in this case it has been damaging to us. The Soviet prelates desire, perhaps, the good of the Christian religion, such as they understand it. They believe that the only means of saving the national Church is to gain the Communists of the Kremlin by declaring themselves convinced Communists, "more Marxist than Marx." They have adopted the entire Communist program, excepting, of course, atheism. This is the main reason why they attack the Papacy with a wholehearted fury worthy of the Militant Atheists, often using the same means without scruple. The real tragedy of all the anti-Roman confessions consists in the fact that they cannot help but further the cause of the "gates of hell" when they combat the Church of Christ, the Catholic Church. In the U.S.S.R. this eternal tragedy is being enacted in a particularly lively and marked way because the efforts of the ungodly to overthrow the Chair of Peter have never been so tremendous nor so intense. These anti-Catholic prelates have been caught in its machinery by the dialectic inherent in anti-Roman separatism. Who knows—it may well be that in the depth of their hearts they realize it and suffer.

Russia has nearly always been closed to Catholic Religious. Foreign Catholic ecclesiastics could enter only with the greatest difficulty. Likewise, the Latin clergy in Russia were not free to go abroad at will and, often because of ethnical and historical reasons, felt no sympathy for the dominant religion. The result of this state of affairs was that in western

Europe there were very vague and often entirely false and unjust ideas on the religious life of the majority of Russians. Sometimes it was manifested in a way that was very injurious to the self-respect of our separated brethren. In former times one could find, even in certain theological manuals, bold generalizations along the lines of this: *Sacerdotes schismatici in ebrietate vivunt*?

It has also happened that some Catholics, for political reasons, took the side of non-Christian enemies of Christian Russia. During the Crimean War some Catholic prelates publicly manifested their joy at seeing Russia combatted by the Turks. This hostile attitude exasperated Khomiakov, the father of modern Russian ecclesiology.[2]

These offenses to national sentiment more than anything else led Khomiakov to formulate his appreciation of Catholicism in this phrase: "The separatism of the Latin West (that is to say the Papacy) is the only real wound of humanity."[3] By a tragic coincidence it is precisely what the atheistic Bolsheviks and the Dissident clergy who are bound to them also think.

The Russians, in general, have a great distaste for Catholic "juridicism," for the Roman Church's discipline, and for the paragraphs of Latin Canon Law. But we would be wrong in seeing in this only the spirit of disobedience, of proud independence. In the Russia of the Czars the pious Orthodox *pravoslav* judged Catholic jurisprudence according to the effects, or rather the defects, of Caesaropapistic jurisprudence, for he had no immediate acquaintance with any other. He found, according to his experience, that the laws and regulations to which the Government of the Empire subjected ecclesiastical life constrained, troubled, and paralyzed (this last expression is that of the Slavophil Aksakov) spiritual life, the apostolic spirit, and purely religious social relations. Exteriorly he accommodated himself to everything, but in his heart he held those chancery offices of the bishop in horror where the civil employees commanded and where the interminable legal and police formalities wither the interior life.

It is through this prism and *by reason of this experience* that the greater part of the dissident Russians view and judge the Roman Church even today as "built on Roman law." Catholicism, or "Papal-Caesarism," is for them merely a Caesaropapism, the more tyrannical, "deadly," and "fatal for the organic conception of the Church" insomuch as it is extended, universal, and "absolute." This psychological element, we think, plays an important role in nourishing the pious *pravoslav's* antagonism to the Catholic Church. This element has only an indirect bearing on the attitude of the pro-Soviet higher clergy.

The most ancient and perhaps the most profound reason for the "Orthodox" antagonism to Catholicism springs from the Orientals' ideas on "society." Whereas for us the State and the Church are two distinct, "perfect societies," for the *pravoslav*, even though very Orthodox, there can be only one perfect society, the State or the Nation, of which the Church is the spiritual aspect. "The State and the Church," writes the celebrated Russian canonist, N. Souvorov, "constitute one sole organism, the State unified by one sole Christian religion."[4]

On his side, the great Russian Metropolitan, Plato Levchine (d. 1812,)

---

2) See, e.g. *Quelques mots a l'occasion d'un mandement de Mgr. l' Archeveque* in the collection *l'Eglise latine et le protestantisme.* Lausanne, 1872, pp. 89 ff.

3) *Letter X a W. Palmer,* fifth ed. of the *Oeuvre completes de A. S. Khomiakov,* Moscow, 1907, p. 394.

4) *Outchebnik tserkovnavo prava,* 5th ed., Moscow, 1913.

said: "The Church and society are so united that they differ between themselves not in essence but in relation. Civil society is the collectivity of men united by the same laws and the same form of government; but the same society, by reason of its being unified by the observance of the same worship, and the same sacred rites, is the Church."[5] The Church should then leave to the State everything which is "social," everything which has to do with the social character of the one national organism. Its role is to be the "spirit" or the "soul" of the Society-State or of the Nation. In the eyes of the Orientals the Catholic Church which firmly maintains its character of a solidly organized, distinct society, is before everything else a State, and eminently dangerous to the sovereignty of other states because of her "pretension of dominating the world." There it is by nature a danger, an enemy of Russian society. Consequently, it is a duty to combat Catholicism, and not only for ecclesiological motives but also for patriotism, especially at the time of great national crises. The prelates of Moscow believe—or pretend to believe—that in attacking the "Vatican" they are defending "Holy Russia" the State, and the Nation. This reasoning is set forth in a clear statement, but it plays a capital role in the "religious subconsciousness" of our separated Oriental brethren, whose minds have been formed according to Platonic traditions. A great deal could be said of Plotinian influence as well, but this interesting theme could draw us too far afield.

These are, in our mind, the principal reasons for the aversion which the separated Christians of Russia feel for Catholicism. The weeds of the atheistic-Christian anti-Roman alliance in the U.S.S.R., and the monstrous calumnies of the Moscow bishops against the Holy Father have grown in this sort of soil. They have been planted in lies, and must be nourished by more lies.

As concerns the Bolsheviks, their purposes are clear enough. They have undertaken the invasion of the entire world with the intention of establishing "progressism." They themselves avow that the one great spiritual force which they fear is the Catholic Church, one and supranational, universal, and of world-wide pretentions. That Church must be defeated at any price, by all possible means, and by exploiting all possible collaborators. The dissident confessions must then be supported insofar as they are anti-Roman, and until such a time as the Catholic Church will have been annihilated. Afterwards, it will not be hard to get rid of the collaborators, thenceforth undesirable. Then they will proceed to suppress the autocephalous Churches and the Protestant sects.

The religious politics of the Kremlin give the dissident clergy and the various confessions clearly to understand that they will be permitted to live in peace, exercise their ministry, although within restricted bounds, if they will show themselves zealous in furthering the Communistic anti-Catholic propaganda, and if they will combat the papacy with theological dissertations and calumny. "Lie, and lie again—something will always stick!"

May God help our separated brethren to understand at last the designs of the impious and the meaning behind the great drama which is being enacted before their eyes. It is a drama which Providence permits so that all may perceive that in the Kingdom of Christ all is dominated and determined by the response given to the great dilemma: *With the one Church of Christ, or against her. There is no such thing as neutrality. You must choose.*

S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J.

5) Soikine ed. of the Complete Works of the Metropolitan Plato Levchine, vol. I, p. 340.

The Rumanian Spirit and Catholicism

THE DIFFICULTIES which impede the rapprochement of the separated Christians are doubtless many and varied. Difficulties of the dogmatic order are intertwined with others of a politico-nationalistic order, and find issue in difficulties of the psychological and social order. As a matter of fact, all these things—the formation of different mentalities, the development of certain prejudices, and the persistence of certain biased convictions and misunderstandings—look to the particular historical circumstances in which the various Christian groups have lived for their explanation. But while these circumstances might explain the origin of separatist motives in the past, they do not justify in any way their existence in the present.

There still remain obstacles which are grievously difficult to acknowledge. It would appear impossible that motives which have no serious foundation, and no real consistence should be stronger than the charity of Christ which should finally unite us!

It seems to us, as regards the separated brethren, that one of the most serious obstacles consists in that nationalistic mentality which so constrains the mind that one is impeded from seeing things in a little wider range, from a more ecumenical point of view, and more in conformity with the spirit of Christ's universal charity. It must be said that there is still a strong tendency prevalent among the "Orthodox" brethren to judge religious matters principally from a national point of view. The very essence of the religion of Christ is confounded with popular religious traditions and with particular practices in external religious manifestations. There is a tendency to confuse far too easily the profession of faith with attachment to an ethnical group, with the result that a Church becomes inconceivable which is not exclusively national and not enclosed with nationalistic limits. It is easy to see that reunion is quite impossible for people whose minds are formed according to such a mentality. It would mean to them the renouncement of their national traditions, of their national history, and of their character as a specific ethnical group. In other words reunion in this light would seem to be a true betrayal.

In Rumania, in the period between the two wars, an attempt has even been made to give a doctrinal basis to this nationalistic mentality; that is, to justify doctrinally, by means of ingeniously elaborated theories, the "Orthodox" ecclesiastical nationalism. Religious particularism has been thus reinforced by new doctrinal systems which, accepting the "ethnical reality" as basis of the constitution of the Church, succeed in maintaining that a purely and exclusively national Church is altogether in conformity with the spirit of Christianity, and that reducing the Church and her salvific action within the national limits is not at all contrary to the doctrine of Christ. Certainly, no greater blow could be given to the concept of the unity and universality of the Church.

Some of the advocates of national particularism in the Church, unfortunately do not stop here. In the attempt to justify the nationalistic exclusivity of their own Church, they will go so far as to affirm that not only the Church as a social organism, but Christianity *in se,* as a religion, becomes national and modifies its intimate structure by identifying itself with the various ethnical realities. In other words, every people which accepts Christianity and assimilates it, transforms it also, and adapts it to

its own character. For some, these transformations are of an accidental nature—although undergoing modifications, Christianity remains invariable *in se*—but for others, the transformations are more profound. It could be said, according to the latter, that practically every people creates for itself its own form of Christianity.

As a typical example of this mentality, we shall make an exposition here of the ideas of an outstanding Rumanian thinker on this matter. The individual in question is Nae Ionescu, former professor of philosophy at the University of Bucharest, and editor of the newspaper "Cuvantul"[1]. According to Nae Ionescu, there would hardly exist a "form of religion" which could serve all men without distinction. Each form of religion is conditioned by historical, ethnical and regional circumstances. But these circumstances differ from region to region and from people to people. Hence the forms of religion also differ to such a degree that they are incompatible among themselves, and irreducible one to the other. There exists, then, says Nae Ionescu, a relation of correlativity between religion and the ethnical group. Religion and the ethnical group condition one another and tend to integrate reciprocally. If, on the one hand, religion is conditioned by the circumstances in which it has developed, on the other hand, it enters as an essential constituent into the specific ethnical character of a people, making an altogether particular impression upon this determined people. Wherefore, *each people has its religion*; or if it does not have it, it makes it, because it is only in that religion which is adapted to its proper spiritual structure that a people feels at ease. From this a conclusion is derived: the sole form of religion adapted to the Rumanian soul is "Orthodoxy" because it is co-natural to the Rumanian people and in conformity with its intimate spiritual structure. Catholicism, on the other hand, since it has been formed under different conditions, would be a quite unnatural religion for the Rumanians because it is an imported religion.

The consequences of this conception are very grave. According to this conception we would have not only independent national Churches, which is a very grievous thing, but even profoundly diverse forms of Christianity, each of which would find itself limited by insuperable barriers and this would impede expansion among peoples of unsuitable historical circumstances and ethnical diversities. What then would be left of Christianity's dynamic universality?

The concepts sketched above would seem to be singularly revealing in respect to that mentality which, we believe, constitutes a barrier to reunion which is one of the most difficult to overcome. It would, therefore, seem to merit the trouble of examination in its particulars, and of formulating a critical judgment upon its validity.

---

1) Nae Ionescu was born at Braila in 1888 and died at Bucharest in 1940. He did his studies in Germany, and beginning with the year 1922, taught philosophy at the University of Bucharest. As professor he exercised great influence over the youth of the university, awakening in the minds of the young a passion for metaphysical and religious problems, and directing them toward the sincere realization of their true vocation. It has been said, and not unjustly, that more than any other, Nae Ionescu has determined the spiritual orientation of the Rumanian youth in the period between the two wars. For this reason we have preferred to fix our attention upon his ideas concerning the problem at hand. The basic characteristics of his philosophy are: realism, anti-individualism, and organicism. Thus he gives very great importance to the idea of the ethnic community. It is a form of life created by God from which no individual may withdraw himself because it claims for itself our whole person, establishes our position in the world, and defines the principles and the surroundings of our very existence and our entire activity. One may then already sense the repercussions which such a conception will have on the problem of relation between religion and the ethnical group. In fact, according to N. Ionescu, religion itself is conditioned by ethnical circumstances, as we shall see.

I. *Church and nation*: two reciprocally embracing realities.

For Nae Ionescu, as well as for all the supporters of ecclesiastical nationalism, the Church in her constitution and structure cannot be other than national. The extension of the Church is determined by ethnical differences and her ends remain closed within the limited circle of national destiny and interest. The Church is, so to speak, incarnated in the nation and participates fully in its limitations. "The Church," says Nae Ionescu, "is superimposed upon the nation, embraces all the members of a people and is extended as far as that people extends." Wherefore, the Church's community of love is structurally and spacially superimposed upon the community in the sense of common national destiny."[2]

This manner of speaking excludes absolutely any universalistic finality in the Church, as it excludes as well its dynamic actuation in the world. National limits cannot be exceeded even by the Church. In fact, Nae Ionescu completely excludes any sort of universalism, and claims that any attempt to unite men in one faith is vain and naive. He attributes the Catholic Church's "universalistic pretention" to lack of realism. The actual extension of Catholicism to so many diverse peoples proves nothing, according to him. Many of these peoples are Catholics only in appearance. Catholicism encloses within its circle spiritual movements which in themselves are in no wise Catholic. In this sense, the Catholic Church is rather a simple grouping together of individuals under the authority of the Pope, and not a communion of souls. Wherefore, the much vaunted universality of the Catholic Church is in fact resolved into something artificial and illusory.[3]

II. *Religion and nation*: two entities which condition one another and reciprocally integrate one with another.

According to Nae Ionescu, the universalistic illusion of the Catholic Church springs from the firm conviction that each man can effectively become a Catholic. This conviction is based upon the notion that since the doctrine of Christ is one, the truth of this doctrine is universal. Now, from taking into account concrete historical conditions, deduce that the truth of Christ's doctrine ought to be accepted by all in the same way. But is this possible? Can just anyone become a Catholic effectively? Is the acceptance of the doctrine of Christ in no way conditioned? Is a universal identity of view concerning the content of the Christian message possible?

At first sight Nae Ionescu does not seem to exclude this possibility absolutely—but only at first sight. Starting with stating facts, more or less well founded, he arrives at the formulation of general principles which are untenable. These principles establish a bond of dependence between religion and the ethnical group and, in the last analysis, denies the inherent universality of the Christian message and its universal destination.

But we shall let him speak. Is it possible to have a universal identity of views concerning the truth of Christ's doctrine? This is his response:

"I do not say that this is impossible. Who knows what God will decide in our regard at the end of the world! I merely *affirm the fact* that this has not yet occurred and that the truth of Christ's doctrine is one for the Orthodox, and *another* for the Catholics, and finally, *another* for the Protestants. It is still more strange that each one of us is convinced that *our*

2) D. Staniloae, *Nationalismul sub aspect crestin*, Gandirea, no. 9, 1937, p. 418.
3) Roza Vanturilor, Bucharest, 1937, p. 203-204.

idea of truth is the real one, and that *our truth is absolute.* From this FACT that no one can place in doubt, I deduce that even if the doctrine of Christ *is one in itself,* the living of it and the understanding of it varies *in time and in space.* In other words, the religious life of an individual, and his participation in doctrine is conditioned historically. From this I conclude necessarily that belonging to a faith is a *natural phenomenon.* God has spoken to me, certainly, but I am unable to understand other than with my faculties as a MAN, and these historically conditioned. Therefore, I can learn the catechism of the Roman Church by memory, I can declare myself Catholic as much as I like; this has no value unless I have lived in the historical conditions in which Catholicism has developed, and unless I myself am the product of those conditions."[4]

"I know," he proceeds, "that there exists a revealed conscience, from whose codification dogmas are born. But it is no less true that if dogmas are in themselves immutable and absolute truths, there exists nevertheless a *history* of dogmas, and this signifies that *revealed truth can be deformed by the pressure of historical realities.*[5] Hence the existence of different religions and different confessions within the framework of the same religion."[6] Wherefore he adds, " a confession cannot extend infinitely; on the contrary, it finds its limits of expansion in certain local and historical circumstances which determine fundamentally distinct structures, and consequently incompatibilities."[7]

These local and historical circumstances are established in the concrete by ethnical and cultural differences. In fact, the ethnical and cultural realities of one group are incommunicable with those of another and are irreducible one to another. Each form of culture is furnished with its own proper subjective faculties for knowing reality. As he says, "each culture judges and evaluates the whole of existence according to its proper method and its proper criterium."[8] It is not by chance, therefore, that the European East is orthodox while the southern West is Catholic. A religious confession has an integrating function and is, in some way, determined by the spiritual ferment of the respective regions. The basic truth in respect to the relation between nation and religion is this: they are correlative realities."[9]

Wherefore: a) Religions are differentiated according to ethnical and cultural differences, because the mode of conceiving and living the word of God is determined by the very ethnical and cultural structure of the people. "Catholicism and Orthodoxy," says Nae Ionescu, "are not only confessions which present certain dogmatic and cultural differences, but they represent *two modes of evaluating existence in general which are fundamentally distinct.* I would say that the dogmatic differences are those which least distinguish them. The great dissidence, the incompatibility, and categorical impenetrability between Catholicism and Orthodoxy have their origin elsewhere: in the historical, concrete spiritual structures which constitute their foundations and within which they realize themselves."[10] If

4) Roza Vanturilor, p. 212-213.
5) Underlining in this passage is our own.
6) Ibid., p 200.
7) Ibid., p. 204.
8) Roza Vanturilor, p. II.
9) Ibid., p. 205.
10) Ibid., p. 205.

this were the case, what possibility of rapprochement would there be between "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism? Even that which has been maintained in common from the same original Christian sources begins to dwindle into insignificance before this radical, determined incompatibility of the ethnical and cultural structures which Nae Ionescu would have at the foundations of "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism. The incompatibility is aggravated by the supposed historical determinants, according to this author, for just as in the case of the ethnical and cultural differences, they cannot be annulled, cancelled or in any way overcome. They chain our existence to a determined mode of living which is absolutely incommunicable.

b) No one may free himself from concrete historical conditions to live the word of God as it is in itself. Living the word of God is fatally subjected to the qualities and the particular faculties of the different ethnical structures, in such wise that normally there do not exist individual modes of living the word of God in the historical realities, but only national modes.[11] In the same way, individual passages from one religion to the other, conversions, would have no value. An individual is fatally bound to the religion in which he is born because he is unable in any way to separate himself from the spiritual structure proper to the people to which he belongs.

c) Religion enters as an essential constituent element in the ethnical structure of a people. A religious confession constitutes an essential note of nationality.[12] "Because the nations", says Nae Ionescu, "are historical realities. They are born in time and space and thus are conditioned by all that belongs to the category of individuation. The attitude of a people toward God, the manner in which he lives not only his bond with the Divinity, but the very Divinity as well, becomes an integrating factor in the intimate structure of the nation."[13]

d) It is not possible to impose upon a people a religion which is not adapted to its spiritual structure. "The structural lack of conformity of a people or a culture to a form of religious life, leads sooner or later to the abandonment of it."[14] "It has been observed," he says, "that Protestantism has brought about great losses to the Catholic Church, but it has been incapable of realizing the slightest progress in the Orthodox countries. The explanation is not in the superiority of "Orthodoxy", as it would please some to believe, but in a much simpler fact: in the fact that the Catholic Church had drawn to itself populations and nations which structurally were unable to conform themselves to the frame-work of the Catholic doctrine;—and which, sooner or later, were necessarily obliged to separate themselves, going out in search of those forms of religious life which were natural for them."[15] "And how is this? Is it that the Germans *were* effectively Catholics up until the year 1518 and afterwards *became* effectively Protestants? Should one also say that a part of the Transylvanian Rumanians were effectively Orthodox up until 1699 and after that date became effectively Catholics? Don't make me laugh! It is more correct to say, I believe, that the Germans were never effectively Catholics—but were always Protes-

11) Cf. D. Staniloe, art. cit., p. 418.
12) Roza Vanturilor, pp. 201, 205.
13) Ibid., p. 200.
14) Roza Vanturilor, p. 75.
15) Ibid., p. 204

tants, and that the Rumanians really did not become Catholics, but have always remained Orthodox . . ."[16]

III. *Catholicism and Rumanism*: two incompatibilities.

According to the logic of these principles Nae Ionescu resolves the problem of whether or not it was possible for the Rumanians to accept Catholicism. His response, of course, can only be negative. That the Rumanians became Catholics is something unthinkable; they could not even if they wished to, given the structural incompatibility between Catholicism and the Rumanian soul. For this reason, Nae Ionescu does not concern himself at all with "Catholic proselytism." No one could ever modify the internal structure of the Rumanian soul.

One should note with what great force of conviction Nae Ionescu maintains his thesis. He takes pleasure in the repeating of it; he revolves it this way and that, and examines it from all sides; at times he affirms it violently as if he wished to hammer it into the minds of his readers. He manifests here once again the great concern which has always tormented him of conserving the originality of our national patrimony and of our culture, and of saving the Rumanian institutions from any contamination of those forms of culture which are not in conformity with our manner of thought and existence. In this we are quite in accord with him. But he makes the mistake of assimilating too easily "forms of religion" with "forms of culture" and above all of treating Christianity, a revealed religion, as he would any other religion.

Is it possible, then, for Rumanians to become Catholics?

"To become Catholics," Nae Ionescu says, "we would need to transform ourselves in our souls so as to be able to realize Catholicism. But this transformation would signify the renunciation of our history and of our spiritual structure. In other words, the renunciation of Rumanism. Here no other possibility exists: either remain a Rumanian, and then your Catholicism is not genuine, or become a Catholic and then you are no longer a Rumanian."[17] Because "to be a Rumanian is an actual state, and to be a Catholic is an actual state. Both represent an organic structure which enclose within themselves spiritual values. But the question is this: are these two structures compatible or not?"[18] If they are not compatible, then there is nothing to be done about it; we cannot nullify the natural forms of life. Even if one wished to become a Catholic, he would be unable, because belonging to a natural category is not realized with an act of the will.[19]

Is it to be supposed that it is enough to will it to be a Rumanian effectively, or that is enough to will to be a Catholic to be it really?[20]

"To be a Rumanian signifies existing in a relation of membership and participation in a collective reality, the nation; it surpasses you, but at the same time it constitutes the very sufficient reason of your existence as a Rumanian. This collective reality is, according to its nature, a spiritual unity, and according to its organic structure, a community of love. . . Wherefore, no one can be a Rumanian and participate effectively in 'Rumanity', if he does not realize in the concrete, in the individual, the

16) Ibid., p. 213.
17) Roza Vanturilor, p. 205-206.
18) Ibid., p. 207, 210-212.
19) Ibid., p. 207, 210-212.
20) Ibid., p. 207.

organic spiritual structure of which the Rumanian nation is essentially the possessor."[21] "To be a Rumanian signifies being molded in a determined mode from which are derived with absolute certainty particular attitudes and actions. In this matter our will can do nothing. The reason is that we cannot normally pass beyond ourselves without ceasing to be ourselves."[22]

So also, to become a Catholic an act of the will does not suffice. If for example, a man born on Rumanian soil, of Rumanian parents, identified, consciously or no with all our history and with all our tradition, reflects upon the various religious confessions, becomes convinced of the superiority of Catholicism over "Orthodoxy," and embraces Catholicism, does he become in as much a Catholic? Not even in your dreams![23] Forms of spiritual life cannot be adapted with a simple act of the will. If you are born in that spiritual climate, very well; if you are not born in it, then there is nothing to be done about it. [24]

Thus Rumanians cannot become Catholics; Rumanism cannot be accommodated to the structure of Catholicism. To accept Catholicism would mean imposing an arbitrary form upon the Rumanian soul. But arbitrary forms cannot be assimilated. Beneath such arbitrarily imposed forms the true reality ever lurks ready to rebel. Therefore, a compenetration between Catholicism and the Rumanian soul could not be realized, and Catholicism would always remain something foreign. The Rumanian spiritual structure is the Orthodox one: "we are Orthodox because we are Rumanians, and we are Rumanians because we are Orthodox".[25]

What then is the position of those Rumanians who call themselves Catholics? They are only Catholics in appearance. Union with the Roman Church is imbued with a hybrid character which is absolutely unsuitable to our spiritual structure. If anyone among those who live in Rumania should actually succeed in realizing the spiritual structure of Catholicism, he would prove himself to be not Rumanian. To be a Rumanian and a Catholic at the same time is an absurdity.[26]

IV. *Observations.*

We have attempted to make a faithful exposition of Nae Ionescu's thought. Now, we shall make some pertinent observations. However, we do not intend to follow him in all details; in fact it is not necessary. We believe that the inconsistency of his thesis will be sufficiently proven by the following points.

(*a.*) First of all, we discover a subtle naturalistic tendency at the basis of these concepts by which Christianity is placed on an equal plane with any other religion. As a matter of fact, Nae Ionescu affirms that *belonging to a faith*—to any faith, therefore belonging to the Christian faith—*is a natural phenomenon.* But is it a natural phenomenon to belong to the Christian faith? Is one born *Christian* just as one is born *Rumanian*? Here Nae Ionescu falls into serious confusion. He forgets that one becomes Christian by means of baptism, and that the effects produced by the Sacrament in the soul of the baptized are not of the natural order, but of the supernatural order of grace. Hence, belonging to the Christian faith

21) Ibid., p. 199-200.
22) Ibid., p. 197.
23) Ibid., p. 207.
24) Ibid., p. 207, 209.
25) Ibid., p. 205, cf. p. 213 and 216.
26) Ibid., pp. 207, 203, 53.

cannot be considered as a natural phenomenon. If Nae Ionescu speaks in this wise, he does not take into account that which is essential in the Christian religion: elevation to the supernatural order by means of divine grace. Since this point is important for the clarification of other difficulties, we shall return to it later.

(b) Nae Ionescu fails to make an accurate distinction between essential and secondary matters in judging religious things. He is confused on other points as well. Thus, in distinguishing between "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism, he dwells solely upon the human, contingent aspects, upon the concrete historical realities "within which they are realized", passing over completely the common fund belonging to the original Christian source. Moreover, he does not admit that they could have a common fund since he considers them as "two modes of evaluating existence in general which are fundamentally distinct." If we take these words in their usual significance, we must say that, according to Nae Ionescu, there is the same distance and the same incompatibility between "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism that there is, for example, between Catholicism and Buddhism, and this is absurd. Thereupon he gives an absolute value to the contingent aspects of "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism and considers them essentials in determining the specific nature of one and the other. Thus, the concrete historical realities which, according to him, fundamentally distinguish "Orthodoxy" from Catholicism, are more *essential to "Orthodoxy" than is the Christian content itself* which is common to these two "forms" of Christianity. Following the consequences of this concept to their natural conclusion, one would have to admit that an individual could very well *be an authentic "Orthodox" without being a Christian,* even denying, for example, truths which essentially belong to the Christian message. It is this that G. Villa once formulated in a very apt phrase: "In Rumania it could be said that even an atheist feels himself profoundly Orthodox if he is a Rumanian."[27]

All this has come about through an effort to define "Orthodoxy" not according to its authentic Christian content, but according to the sort of fantastic interpretations which the people have evolved as a consequence of a religious life which has been badly directed, or better, as a consequence of a lack of real religious formation. N. Crainic, before becoming the head of the Orthodoxist Movement, had perceived clearly when he said that in this case the people were merely Christian in name, and that their mentality dominated by superstitions, cannot represent the substance of evangelical Christianity.[28] But in the minds of many, there is a deeply rooted tendency to consider as authentically orthodox all that which the unbridled imagination of the people has woven about the facts of the Gospel and the Christian dogmas—even if they contain grave errors, and even if they are bound up with superstitions which are absolutely inadmissable from the Christian point of view.[29] Nae Ionescu is affected by this mentality. His sympathies are borne toward that world of popular beliefs which, while having their fascination and interest from a folk-loristic point of view, are none the less mixed with falsehood.[30]

27) Rumanian Philosophers, in *Humanits,* no. 7, 1946, p. 685.

28) See *Gandirea,* No. 5, 1923 p. 391.

29) In this reference see S. Mehedinti, *Crestinismul romanesc,* Bucharest, 1941, where the author presents the most fantastic interpretations as authentically Christian. It is noteworthy that the book was favorably received by the "Orthodox" press.

30) For Nae Ionescu's mentality in this regard, see, for example, the article *Biscrica taranilor,* in Roza Vanturilor, p. 34-36.

In this aspect "Orthodoxy" becomes something absolutely incompatible with Catholicism—but only because, we add, it has first become incompatible with the Gospel. In other words, *the "Orthodoxy" that Nae Ionescu presents as organically fused with the Rumanian spiritual structure is not authentic "Orthodoxy"; and if it makes the Rumanian soul incompatible with Catholicism, it does so only in the measure in which it departs from the fundamental truth of the Gospel.* If Nae Ionescu were obliged to define "Orthodoxy" according to its Christian content, there would certainly not be this irreducible incompatibility.

(c) Moreover, in insisting upon the untransmittability of the forms of spiritual life, Nae Ionescu, perhaps without being aware of it, goes as far as to *deny the universal destiny of Christianity.* As a matter of fact, he gives to understand that no one of the three "forms" of Christianity—Catholicism, "Orthodoxy", and Protestantism—could become the religion of humanity because each one is bound by limits of expansion in certain historical and local circumstance which determine fundamentally distinct structures, and hence incompatibilities. The very existence of the three "forms" of Christianity would prove that "a confession cannot be extended ad infinitum." Now if the three "forms" of Christianity are actually found without distinction in these conditions, it signifies that *Christianity* has not in itself sufficient force to overcome the obstacles erected by the different ethnical and cultural differences of the peoples; its capacity of diffusion is therefore limited. In an attempt to expand, Christianity would necessarily encounter impossible difficulties and be vanquished. Fundamentally, Christianity also would remain a simple local phenomenon to which, as such a universal validity could not be attributed.

It is evident that for a religion to have a universal validity and destiny it must comprise within itself sufficient internal dynamism to overcome all the obstacles that arise from differences in culture, ethnical character, and social conditions. It must fully satisfy the deep aspirations of the human soul in every place and time, respond to the great problems which torment it, and reach to the profound point of contact in which all humanity, in spite of the multiplicity and diversity of conditions, finds itself united and capable of spiritual communication.

Certainly, such a religion could not be the work of man. A natural religion would always remain subject to historical contingencies and necessarily bound to the local circumstances in which it was born. Any pretense of embracing all humanity would be vain. Its fate would be conditioned by particular human elements, and would be confined within their limits. Only a religion of divine origin is capable of transcending human limitations and human contingencies in such wise as to affirm its universal validity.

Now we maintain that this religion of divine origin in fact exists. It is the religion instituted by Jesus Christ which teaches and offers salvation to every human being without distinction. Whoever believes in the divinity of Jesus Christ should be in accord with us on this point. But it is a fact that Christianity is divided into different confessions. Which one of these confessions truly represents the authentic and integral Christianity? We do not intend to set forth here the objective proofs which afford us the conviction that integral Christianity is represented, and beyond all possible doubt, by Catholicism. In order to show the absurdity of the position held by Nae Ionescu it is enough to know the following: *Christianity is a religion*

of divine origin and, as such, has a universal scope. Indeed, if the statements of Nae Ionescu were true, the precept of Jesus, "Go, teach all men", would have been utopian and, even useless because not all men would be able to receive the Christian message. Some people, for example, could very well have refused to accept the idea of a God who died on the cross for the salvation of the world or have rejected the dogma of the Trinity on the grounds of "structure." Now, if Jesus was true God, He would know if there were people whose spiritual make-up is absolutely incompatible with the Christian message and thus, that they require a form of religion different from that which He proposed. But the Gospel in no way makes mention of such a thing. Rather, the whole effect of the Gospel is that the Christian message is destined for all men, that Jesus has come to die for the salvation of the whole world, that all people are equally called to become part of the Kingdom of God—a Kingdom which is already being realized in this world.[31]

(*d*) We do not ignore the difficulties met with in advancing the Christian message among widely differing mentalities and among diverse grades of culture and tradition. Sometimes they are found to be strongly opposed to the content of this message. We realize perfectly how difficult it is at times to create the proper psychological atmosphere for the difficult of Christian truths. Acceptance of the Christian Faith is first of all a question of grace, but nevertheless, without forgetting this, the historical reasons which are at the base of so many particular concepts and traditions do have their importance. In this regard Nae Ionescu could be correct when he says that an individual cannot understand the word of God except with the faculties of an historically conditioned man; that is, with a particular mentality, and expecially with the expression of his culture and his ethnical make-up. But it is one thing to recognize the importance of a psychological atmosphere and another to intend that the subsequent difficulties could constitute incompatibilities in the depths of humanity which are irreducible even before the Gospel.

The historical conditions which determine a psychological atmosphere are what they are and are worth what they are worth. Insofar as they are objective, they are not less contingent and subject to changes and modifications. For Nae Ionescu, on the other hand, they represent something rigid and absolute. The historical, spiritual composition is, for him, something inviolable. It assimilates only that which is perfectly in conformity with its particular character. Therefore, in a meeting between a particular mentality and the Christian message, Nae Ionescu admits the possibility of modifications and adaptions only on the side of the Christian message which, he declares, can be changed by the pressure of historical realities. But then, how do we maintain a religious education? How do we preserve that intimate transformation which is realized in us through living the Christian message? In order truly to live Christianity we must in fact be spiritually transformed so as to attain its far reaching demands. This means that, in receiving Christianity, we must try to make our innermost selves always more conformable to the spirit of Christ. We must therefore modify, purify our own mentality, our way of thinking, our manner of conceiving life, the universe, existence: everything which in any way we find in contrast to the truth of the Gospel and to the spirit of Christ. In other words, we must form in.

31) Cf. Matt. XVIII, 18-20; John X, 16; Matt. XIII, 31-35.

ourselves another mentality and another way of thinking: "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus . . ." declared St. Paul who exhorted the faithful to renounce the "old man" in order to put on the "new man" according to Christ. Now this changing of a particular mentality is not possible if we admit the rigid psychological orientation of Nae Ionescu. Nor is that continual transformation possible which the Christian life demands of us in order to advance ever closer to Christ, our ideal.[32]

(*e*) At the same time Nae Ionescu gives excessive importance to ethnical structures; he leans too heavily on the differential element in humanity and forgets the common, human substratum. For him nationalism is invested with a kind of ontological character. He thus attributes to the ethnic and cultural composition of the faculties themselves the power to guide and give value to the whole of existence.

We do not underestimate the importance and value of ethnical realities and differences in the human race. They show the many possibilities that human nature has of perfecting itself and testify to the richness of creation. We must remember, however, that the fundamental nucleus of the human personality *is human* before it is national, and that it is not nationalism which forms the principle of our activity and existence in the world, but our humanity. Our destiny, before being national, is a human destiny and, as such, coincides in its essence with that of all men. In every country, in whatever place or time, and in the midst of widely diversified historical circumstances, the human spirit and the human mind are basically ever the same. Under infinitely diverse appearances humanity presents the same face.

Now, the Christian religion makes its appeal precisely to this foundation common to all mortals who remain the same beneath all their national differences. The voice of Christ finds an echo in every man because in its depths every human heart is troubled by the same problems. The conviction, therefore, of the Catholic Church that "every man can become a Catholic" is not without foundation. And when it goes abroad to make converts in the whole world, it is not—to use the ironic expression of Nae Ionescu—that it lacks a critical spirit and realism or that it does not take into account particular historical conditions and concrete reality. Its realism, rather, is more profound than that professed by Nae Ionescu himself, because it is established on the truth of the equality of human nature and on the identity of the destiny of men.

(*f*) Nae Ionescu says further that the forms of spiritual life, all of which are conditioned by history, are suitable only in the conditions in which they were spontaneously born. Now, Christianity as a religion, as a form of spiritual life, was born in Palestine in Hebrew surroundings and in the midst of the particular historical, ethnical, and cultural circumstances of the Hebrew people. Jesus, Himself, as man, possessed the Hebrew ethnical structure. The religion preached by Jesus should have been in this case "Hebraically" conditioned and, as such, adapted first of all to the Hebrew character—so much the more so since the Hebrews were and have remained a people with a well defined ethnical personality. Christianity should have been enclosed within the boundaries of the Hebrews and have remained so since it was more less a form of spiritual life born in Hebraic surroundings. How, then, has it embraced other peoples while the Jews themselves have

32) D. Staniloae accuses Nae Ionescu of having fallen into error of the Protestants when he denies the possibility of bettering and conquering ourselves.

refused it? Only because they had not yet followed the theories of Nae Ionescu? What is even more strange is that Christianity was received by peoples who were repelled by anything Hebraic. This religion outraged the customs, the mentality, the religious, ethnical, political, and social traditions of the Greco-Roman world and was little adapted to the rude and violent temperament of the barbaric peoples. And yet, it penetrated the Greco-Roman world and transformed it, supplanting the forms of spiritual life which had been born spontaneously in the historical conditions proper to that world. It was accepted by the barbarians themselves in spite of their reluctance.

And this happened because it was presented not as a Hebraic product but as the "good tidings" of the Son of God made man for the salvation of all men. The theories of Nae Ionescu show their falseness when applied to the religion of Christ. The Christian religion is not subjected to the laws of contingency which rule the genesis and development of the different cultures and other religions. [33]

(*g*) If Christianity is a religion with a universal end, the Church itself must have this end, must be open to all people and must strive with a continuous drive to embrace all men. It cannot have, therefore, a constitution which is in contradiction to this innate universality; it cannot have a constitution with a structure and an end which is exclusively national. A national church is not in a position to attain the exigencies inherent in Christianity. If Christianity is a universal religion, the Church cannot restrain its activity within national limits nor can it be placed exclusively at the service of one sole nation. Therefore, it is false to say, as Nae Ionescu does, that the Church is superimposed in its structure and in its extent on the nation, embracing all the members of one people and extending to the limits of a determined people. If he intended to define in these words the actual situation of the "Orthodox" Church, then we can agree. But similar statements cannot be applied to the Church of Christ. The limits of the Church of Christ are those of humanity itself; outside of these it knows no others. If it admitted that it could be exclusively national, the Church would deny itself and fail the mission given to it by its Founder. Who would have the obligation of evangelizing the non-believers if every Christian community remained enclosed within itself?

What would have happened to Christianity if the first Christians had thought as the separated national Churches of the East do today? This is a valid reason why, as we think, "Orthodoxy" cannot represent authentic Christianity. It encloses itself within national limits, confusing itself with particularities and with national egoism; it passes over an essential mission of the Church of Christ: the preaching of the Gospel to every human creature.

(*h*) There remains another difficulty to overcome. According to Nae Ionescu it comes from the *history of dogmas* which proves that, "revealed truth can be deformed by the pressure of historical reality." That Christian truth can be deformed by men, we readily agree. But the true name of this deformation is *heresy*! It means the altering of the true sense of the truth taught in the beginning by Jesus and perpetually proposed by the Church. According to Nae Ionescu, on the other hand, *heresy is entirely legitimate and perfectly justifiable.* It can be called upon and justified by the historical conditions and by the particular ethnical structure of a people

33) On the transcendence of the Christian religion even N. Crainic has written beautiful pages. See, for example, *Rasa si religiune in Candirea.*

who are capable of adapting themselves to the framework of Christian dogma. Now, we are not aware that Jesus has given to the ethnical structure of peoples the faculty to create, according to their particular needs, a religion proper and distinct from other peoples, nor that He has given the right to the popular mentality of interpreting authentically the truths proposed by Himself. The true religion was established once and for all by God Himself. The authentic interpretation of the content of Christian faith was conferred on the Church. No one has the right to establish other criteria for revealed truth or to teach anything different from that which was declared by Jesus and which is authentically interpreted and infallibly taught by the Church.

(*i*) Nor is it possible to say that the same Christian truth can have many true senses in such a way that there would be indeed *one truth* for the Catholics, *another* for the "Orthodox" and *another* again for the Protestants, as Nae Ionescu claims. Among these three truths *subjectively true,* there must also be one *objectively true.* Otherwise we must admit this absurdity: the truth of Christ theoretically one and universal, can undergo many interpretations each of which are equally true and authentically Christian even though opposed and contradictory to each other. Thus, to go over into the field of moral principles, one which upholds the indissolubility of marriage and the other which allows divorce must be both equally true and both in perfect accord with the teaching of Christ. But this is absurd.

Among the different formulas which express religious and moral principles, the *true formula* is not that which eventually corresponds, according to certain contingent circumstances, to a determined nationalistic make-up, but that which corresponds in fact to the genuine thought of Christ. Therefore, when Nae Ionescu says that the Rumanians cannot receive Catholicism because their natural form of spiritual life is different and when he affirms that the Rumanians cannot, above all, admit the principle which stands at the bottom of the Catholic conception in regard to the constitution of the Church, since this is fundamentally contrary to their particular "form of mind", the thing most necessary to know is this: up to what point does the "Rumanian" concept of the Church correspond to the thought of Jesus Christ? And if the Catholic formula is true instead of the other one, *the Rumanians must accept it,* even though actually it be repugnant to their spiritual make-up. For the rest then, their simple acceptance of the Christian message imposes renunciations.

Even here, then, above the particular mentality stands the eternal truth of the Gospel to which one must conform even more and more by means of continual purification. In our case, however, we do not at all believe that in order to realize Catholicism we must positively renounce all our history and all our ethnical individuality, as Nae Ionescu would have us understand. It is more right to say that *we must only purify our mentality* so as to make it ever more conformable to authentic Christianity.

(*j*) After all that we have said it would be almost superfluous to stop also on that strange formula into which Nae Ionescu forces the conclusions of his theories: "We are Orthodox because we are Rumanians and we are Rumanians because we are Orthodox." The analysis, however, of this formula gives us the opportunity of clarifying still further a few points which remain a bit obscure.

"We are Orthodox because we are Rumanians . . ." In other words we

are "Orthodox" because our ethnical make-up necessarily demands this form of religion, the sole religion adapted to our national character. We should be "Orthodox", so to say, by a kind of natural inclination. The Rumanian soul has an innate predisposition towards "Orthodoxy" or, to put it differently, among the specific demands of the Rumanian spirit, as such, is "Orthodoxy" which gives us a pre-stabilizing harmony. And thus, "Orthodoxy" is the sole form of religion which really belongs to the Rumanians.[34]

This manner of thinking, formulated in slightly different ways, is also found in other authors who say that the Rumanians, if they were able to choose from among diverse forms of religion, would be spontaneously orientated toward "Orthodoxy" as their natural form of spiritual life.[35]

It is clear that here the supreme criterion for the acceptance of a religion is the ethnical structure of people with its particular needs. Now we do not admit that the "national needs" can be more conveniently found *in heresy* than in the truth. The national needs cannot, moreover, be placed above objective truth. Therefore, the conformity of "Orthodoxy" to the Rumanian character is not a valid argument to judge its truth. It is necessary to see, according to other criteria, whether representative "Orthodoxy" is truly the authentic form of Christianity. In the case of an affirmative answer, however, you must follow it *not insofar as you are a Rumanian,* but insofar as you are *a man,* who, as such, has need of saving his soul. In the case of a negative answer, on the other hand, you must abandon it even if it fully responds to your national needs because, we repeat, the national exigencies do not take precedence over objective truth.

Moreover, if "Orthodoxy" were the true form of Christianity, it should be adaptable not only to the Rumanians but to all peoples on the grounds of the universal destiny of the Christian religion. And, indeed, why should the Rumanians have a special inclination toward "Orthodoxy"? Just as the Rumanians have it, if they have it, so too others must have it. Or, perhaps, the Rumanians are more capable than others of realizing the ideal of "Orthodoxy"? Some have affirmed this. But we do not see with what reason.

To say, then, that the Rumanian people have been spontaneously orientated toward "Orthodoxy" in the period of their formation as an individual nation is untenable. First of all, "Orthodoxy", as a distinct form of Christianity did not exist in the period in which the ethnical individuality of the Rumanan people was crystallized. Secondly, the Rumanians knew Christianity for the first time under a Latin form. As the etymology of essential words in Christian vocabulary shows, it is only much later that historical events obliged them to undergo the influence of Byzantium and to follow it into schism. *Nothing* proves, therefore, that the Rumanians are *naturally "Orthodox."* In no case do the principles of Nae Ionescu have an unshakable validity. We would say, rather, that the Rumanians, being a people of the Latin race, should feel themselves more carried over towards Catholicity since this "form of religion" is considered as a specific product of the Latin world.

"We are Rumanians because we are Orthodox . . ." Expressing himself in this way, Nae Ionescu means that "Orthodoxy" constitutes the very

34) On just what this suitability or what this innate predisposition is founded, Nae Ionescu does not say. The statements in this matter come from his theory regarding the connection between collectivity among religions and nationalism.

35) Cf. N. Crainic, "Spiritualitate si romanism", in *Gandirea,* 1936, n. 8, p. 379.

essence of our nationalism. In this sense, however, "Orthodoxy" cannot be considered—if not according to its external, contingent manifestations—according to the effects produced by its influence on Rumanian culture and art, on the popular mentality and traditions, and not according to its very essence. Insofar as it is a Christian religion, "Orthodoxy" cannot enter as an essential, constitutive element in the ethnical structure of a people. The Christian religion produces in the souls of the faithful effects which, being of a supernatural order, cannot enter into a necessary relation with the national character of the faithful. What, for example, does the rite of baptism give to Rumanian nationalism as such? By means of baptism, administered according to the "Orthodox rite," does a non-Rumanian become a Rumanian? Can divine grace impress a national character on a person? And, consequently, can it constitute the specific note of an ethnical individuality? Can it enter as an essential, constituitive element in the ethnical structure of an individual? To be a Rumanian and to be a Christian are two things absolutely distinct. Certainly, one can be a Christian and a Rumanian at the same time, but he is not Rumanian because he is Christian, nor Christian because Rumanian. The Christian as such, does not impress on anyone an ethnical character just as he does not take away from anyone his proper national character. Christianity only elevates, ennobles the determined ethnical character by raising and healing first of all human nature itself.

There cannot be, therefore, a necessary relationship between "Orthodoxy" and "Rumanianism". One who is not baptized can have the ethnical Rumanian make-up very well, but one who is not Christian is not even "Orthodox." Thus, it is not "Orthodoxy" which constitutes a specific character. Nae Ionescu would have understood, as we have seen, that one can be "Orthodox" naturally. But then even an atheist can be called an "Orthodox," and an unbeliever, as long as he has been born and lived in the conditions in which "Orthodoxy" has been developed. From every side that one looks the theories of Nae Ionescu always emerge absurd.

Conclusion

Does anything solid remain in the whole of that edifice of argumentation erected by Nae Ionsecu to show the impossibility of a union between the Rumanian spirit and Catholicism? Anyone who takes the pains to untangle the skeins ingeniously woven in the dialectic of Nae Ionescu in regard to this problem will respond "Nothing". To one of his admirers, however, or to one has been, even indirectly, his disciple, this boldly expressed response may seem exaggerated. Nae Ionescu, who has been rightly defined as a Christian philosopher, who in the field of religion moved with such competence and ease, who has given generations of young people an interest in religious problems, is he really to be considered as one who built upon moving sands? Indeed, with the risk of hurting some feelings, we repeat the Nae Ionescu, with his theory in regard to the relation between religion and nationalism as applied to Christianity, is not only on a false road, but at times has fallen into absurdity. His conclusions in respect to this problem are absolutely inadmissible. We do not say this merely from the Catholic point of view because someone may believe that we looked at the matter only from the viewpoint of a particular confession, but they are inadmissible simply from the Christian point of view. The principles

which establish the necessary connection of dependence between religion and nationalism applied without distinction to Christianity injure the most elementary truths of the Gospel. These principles applied to Christianity? Nae Ionescu does not take into account the divine origin of the Christian religion, its transcendence, its universal scope—things which have nothing to do with his ethnical determinism. That Nae Ionescu, at least on this point, is outside of Christian truth has been declared also by a noteworthy dissident theologian, D. Stanislaoe, who is certainly not pro-Catholic.[36]

Nae Ionescu does indeed use Christian concepts, does employ Christian elements in his demonstrations, but, at bottom, his conclusions deprive Christianity of its characteristic essence: that of being the sole true religion, the religion of humanity, transcendent, and, as such, withdrawn from the laws of historical contingency. This religion is not the product of a race, of a people, or of a culture. It can transform the character of a people, can educate, elevate, ennoble it; but its essence and its inmost value do not depend either on the character of the people or on their culture no matter how elevated it may be. These are matters which Nae Ionescu does not take into account at all and it is because of this fact that his system is inconsistent. His theories could be true if the Christian religion did not exist with its uniqueness and with its refusal as the religion of God's Son made Man to be enclosed within human categories. If the transcendence of the Christian religion is admitted, the whole dialectical edifice of Nae Ionescu crumbles; but if the theories of Nae Ionescu are admitted, it is necessary to reject a large part of the Gospel. Now, up to this point, it is safer to preserve the Gospel in its integrity.

The inconsistency of his judgment is now apparent on the incompatibility between "Orthodoxy" and Catholicism. "Orthodoxy", for one who is authentically Christian, cannot be considered as a phenomenon specifically Oriental, just as Catholicity in its essence is not a product of the Latin world. Does the particular aspect they present caused by contact with peoples of different races and with different cultures lessen the common Christian content? Neither ethnical structures nor dogmatic differences can create that fatal and irreducible incompatibility found by Nae Ionescu. At bottom, the things which unite us, the things which we have in common are much more profound and stronger than those which separate us. That there are difficulties in the pyschological order we readily admit. These, however, are not insurmountable as Nae Ionescu without foundation would have it. And so also is the statement on the incompatibility between the Rumanian spirit and Catholicism entirely gratuitous. Even if the Rumanian ethnical character were indissolubly bound to "Orthodoxy", one could not say that this fact constitutes an incompatibility toward Catholicism in the face of the common Christian content of Catholicism and "Orthodoxy." Therefore we reject the notion that a meeting of the Rumanian spirit and Catholicism is impossible. This approach moreover could be facilitated by the events which are taking place today in Rumania. Many are changing their ideas in respect to the national Church. The universal Church, on the other hand, has won the sympathy and the admiration of many separated brethren because of the shining example given by its bishops and priests in face of the Communist oppressor. On this point Professor Mirces

36) Cf. Nationalis. sub aspect moral, loc. cit., p. 419.

Eliade, even though a disciple of Nae Ionescu, wrote sometime ago that the Rumanians have never found themselves so close to the Church as now and that the faith professed by this sister Church has never appeared to the whole nation stronger or more fecund than in these days of tribulation.

ALEXANDER MIRCEA

Father Paul of Graymoor*

SINCE THE death in 1940 of Father Paul James Francis Wattson, S.A., the founder of the Octave of Prayer for Unity, there has been a constant and steadily-growing demand for an authentic biography by a qualified author. This demand is not confined to Catholics—some of the stanchest and most affectionate friends of Father Paul of Graymoor were among those who continued Anglican after his own conversion. There are Orthodox priests who today hold his name in benediction; one Methodist minister at least has made a pilgrimage to his tomb; Jews and non-believers pride themselves on his friendship and his guidance. And this is all the more remarkable when one considers that a love and zeal for the Holy See marked the whole of his Catholic life, and that as an Anglican his "platform" for Reunion was distinguished by constant advocacy of unqualified submission to the authority of the Roman Pontiff. Again, this enthusiastic demand for an authentic guide to his life has not been confined to America or the English-speaking countries. Some of the very highest tributes to the memory of this 20th century American priest cited in this book come from Rome, from Athens, from India and China.

The present volume has been worth waiting for. Father Gannon, of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, the congregation founded by Father Wattson while he was still Anglican and corporately received with him into the Catholic Church in 1909, enjoys the advantages of personal contact with his subject—for a period extending over some 10 years, access to the archives of the Friars and the Sisters of the Atonement, generous communication with priests and prelates and layfolk who knew Father Paul even before he did—in some cases even in the Anglican days. Blessed with an ability to weigh and to analyse, he has grasped the central theme of Father Paul's life of manifold labor and of joy and of sorrow and keeps it before his readers throughout the volume. To those whose primary concern is the ideal of unity among Christians at this crucial period of the world's history, this will come as no surprise. Wherever in the world today specific means for directing Christian believers towards a grasp of the necessity of Union are discussed, one principle at least is agreed upon—that prayer is necessary for the consummation of such a desire, however dimly perceived. Remarkable indeed is the fact that so many, Catholics and those still separated from the Catholic Church, have found in the Chair of Unity Octave, or variations on its theme, a concrete form of prayer that has a special appeal for the practical-minded and the visionary alike. It would be remarkable if anyone who moved for a time in association with Father Wattson would fail to perceive that the crystallization of the Octave idea in his mind was a natural consummation of the ideal that motivated him in the service of Christ from his childhood. "That they all may be one" might well have been the sub-title of this fascinating volume.

Yet, and of this there is real danger (as the author takes pains to point out) the life of Father Wattson was so many-faceted that some might distort one or the other of his interests and make of it the most characteristic manifestation of his spirit. Father Paul the Franciscan added new vitality to the seraphic ideals of Saint Francis in 20th century America. Father Paul the preacher had a passion for the active ministry and never passed up an opportunity to retell the glorious details of the Good News brought to earth by

*) David Gannon, S. A., *Father Paul of Graymoor*, with a preface by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951; 10-372 pp. Doll. 4.00.

Jesus Christ. Father Paul in his own spiritual life showed that the Christian emphasis on mortification and the chastisement of the flesh could sanctify America, or even the world. This same man restrained his hopes for the speedy growth of the religious congregation he founded in order to sustain the heroes of the faith in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the Sea. If America had been notably cold in its attitude towards Oriental Christians (a charge made often in Europe, and not without foundation, though more often with concentration on one or the other isolated fact) this man was to help create a Pontifical Association that has for its object the subventioning of Catholic Christians of the East and the tempering of at least the material hardships of their separated kinsmen. If material prosperity had somewhat dulled the charity of some whose God is Love, this man's name would remain to recall innumerable examples of lavish and even indiscriminate charity. If there should be criticism of some missionaries to concentrate, almost exclusively on spiritual values, Father Paul of Graymoor must be reckoned with those who saw the need of imitating the concern of Jesus Christ for the sick and the maimed among men, witnessed to in the organization of the Catholic Medical Mission Board. If some lament that the Church today has no inspired preachers like Saint Paul, the founder of Graymoor can be cited as a pioneer, and an eminently successful one, in the field of utilizing the radio as a means of spreading Catholic truth. The North American continent, the West Indies, India itself know of the Ave Maria Hour and its popularization of Christian virtues through the medium of dramatic portrayal of the lives of the saints. Nor is this all. World economy, capitalism, and financial manipulations have made our century a sorrowful one in which to live. Father Paul Wattson, who himself owned nothing, was able to put the worldly goods of others to use in a variety of ways—maintaining cloistered nuns who had no other means of material support, sheltering the homeless, befriending those who had fallen through some unfortunate weakness. All this he did to the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of those who were contributors to his numerous projects or recipients of the aid made possible through them.

All this Father Gannon tells us in this volume, one obviously written in the spirit of love and admiration, yet strictly adhering to the truth in its factual narration. Father Paul had his faults, which we are reminded were not absent from the saints. Father Paul had many friends; he was not without his enemies —within the Church and within the very congregation he had nurtured with a lavish love. Father Paul made mistakes—he is known to have antagonized the mighty, to have used open discussion where diplomatic means would have been more advisable; his generosity often impoverished the group that was trying to follow his example in the religious life. A less competent biographer would have devised means to avoid discussing all this, and thus give us only a distorted though idealized picture. For avoiding this the writer deserves unqualified praise, and the spiritual magnitude of his central figure grows in our estimation.

The complete record of Father Paul's accomplishments is a task that few would dare to venture on, and fewer still could finish with notable success. Abundant information on the great prayer movement that had its inspiration at Graymoor, most vital information for an understanding of the true measure of the man, is given in Chapter XIII (The Church Unity Octave, pp. 134-149) and Chapter XX (The Octave Extended to the Universal Church, pp.

256-283.) These passages, we are pleased to find, are written with painstaking accuracy.

We are grateful that detailed information is given about the circumstances of the founding of the Chair of Unity Octave, since it should serve to correct erroneous impressions now current in the unionistic field. We are also shown the real and essential difference between the Octave as conceived by Father Paul of Graymoor and prayer efforts of a more general nature which have since been popularized in various parts of the Christian world, such as the *Universal Week of Prayer for Christian Unity,* propagated by the Abbe Couturier of Lyons, and the prayer week sponsored by the *World Conference on Faith and Order.* The author describes the concept of Unity which Father Paul developed and crystallized in his intentions for the *Octave.* Long before the *Instruction of the Holy Office* and the encyclical *Humani Generis* he had taken the stand that a Catholic movement for Christian reunion should make a clear affirmation of the claims of the Church of Peter, although he left no doubt of his respects and understanding towards the sincere efforts of pious souls outside the Church, who, because of their vague or erroneous notions of papal authority prayed for a solution to the problem of Christian unity which would be "pleasing to Christ." Thus he left to his spiritual children a precious heritage in the work of extending the observance of a Unity Octave which specifically implores that all outside the Holy Catholic and Roman Church should be led to accept Catholic and apostolic authority.

It is with good reason that his sons should see the need of defending the particular ethos of the Unity Octave, and should strive to prevent any obscuring of it. Nevertheless, we feel that attention should be called to a possible misunderstanding in the author's citation of the encyclical *Humani Generis* which follows his explanation of the difference between the Octave and later prayer movements that take place at the same time. We would have striven to make clear that what is condemned in the encyclical is not "Eirenic Theology" but "*an 'eirenism',*" "*an imprudent* 'eirenism'," "*false* 'eirenics'" (as cited in the quoted part of the Encyclical, pp. 278-279, of the book, italics ours.) There is such a thing as sound eirenism and it is quite in accord with the very important second paragraph of the Instruction to Local Ordinaries on the *Ecumenical Movement,* cited in part for us on pages 279-280. This passage reads (cf. UNITAS, English language edition, Vol. II, No. 1, p. 51:) "At this time in many parts of the world, owing partly to various external events and changes of mental attitude, but, under the inspiring grace of God, *due chiefly to the common prayers of the faithful,* a desire has awakened and is growing daily in the hearts of many, who are separated from the Catholic Church, that a reunion be accomplished among all who believe in Christ the Lord. *Assuredly to the children of the true Church this is a source of holy joy in the Lord* as well as an inducement to lend their assistance *to all who are sincerely seeking the truth,* by entreating light and strength for them from God in fervent prayer." We feel certain that Father Wattson would have been overjoyed by these expressions, particularly when the common prayers of the faithful ascend to God from every part of the Catholic world during the Octave in January.

We have said that this book has been worth waiting for. It is no understatement to say that it is bound to carry those who read its account of the fascinating activities—incredible in their scope and ambition—of a great hero of our day to some emulation of his zeal. For those who talk or even think of a

Christianity united in authority and in faith and worship this book offers much help by representing the guidance of a devoted pioneer in the vast field of unionistic work.

There are a number of valuable photographs reproduced in the volume, including several hitherto unpublished ones. It has a very thorough index, a feature often forgotten in popular biographies. On its cover it reproduces the device worn by Friars and Sisters of the Atonement, the symbolism of which is explained on page 87 of the text. The preface by His Eminence Cardinal Spellman reflects the deep appreciation of an eminent churchman for the friar who blazed the path in Catholic efforts for *The Reunion of Christendom.*

DUNSTAN DONOVAN, S.A.

Comments and Documents

HOW A CHINESE MARTYR DIES FOR CHRIST

(The letters printed below were written by a Chinese convert while awaiting first baptism and then martyrdom. They finally arrived in the hands of the friend to whom they were addressed, along with the information that the martyrdom had been consummated. Although we are obliged to withold the names involved, we may guarantee the authenticity of the text. These letters stand in no need of our comment. The spirit that strengthened St. Ignatius of Antioch and St. Cyprian is found perfectly at home in the breast of this martyr who joyfully gave his life to Christ in modern China. All are one in Christ; there is no longer Jew, nor Greek . . . nor Chinese.)

WHAT HAVE I to say to you dear friend? Here is a blossom which will make your day fragrant indeed. For you are soon to be my brother in Christ! Do not wrinkle your brow, for I will tell all. On the Feast of the Epiphany I shall be received into the Church. How lovely this is you will know. I will come with the kings and though I have no gifts I shall give Him what I have and, so shortly I expect, my life for His sake.

One day last September as I sat and contemplated the Beauty of the Godhead, there came into my vision as it were a word which I can best tell to you as IPSE. There it stayed and I knew it to be the Word of God of which I have heard tell by you so often. And that word I knew to be the Christ. Ipse, Ipse. What a wonder of joy and loveliness. To have dwelt on the Divine Being since childhood is to have realized the majesty of that which is ineffable.

How more than incredible is the belief that all this has become Flesh! If we were to sit ourselves down now and just dwell on that one thought "Ipse" then we would never cease to contemplate in wonder to all Eternity and that would be Heaven. So we do not see Him even now as He is for that would be to suspend all the senses and to die to all but that. How much lovelier is Heaven now. Even as this garden is more fragrant after the raindrops, so is Heaven after He came down as dew upon the fleece. So we in the East come to Him through contemplation, you in the West through action and mere rational thought. I cannot reason Christ. If I were to reason Christianity as the Church gives it to me perhaps there would be much that might give me a spirit form of your favourite complaint in the West—chronic dyspepsia. But in the Beauty of the Word, there is all, and more than all.

I am not afraid to go to my Christ. For this step might mean that. I cannot hope to keep my present position once I have become a Catholic and soon after that I am bound to be taken for what I have believed. Do not worry for me. All is well. I die for my people who are in darkness. For China is in darkness my friend; not the darkness of the night which has the shadows of God's moon and stars, but the darkness of a room in which a man has drawn the blinds so that the sunshine and the laughter of the children shall not enter in . . . It is an honourable death, so much more honourable than my life has been.

What of Our Lord? (And is there not in those words the music of all the stars in their courses?) I said to my mind, abundant in its conceit, "Here is a man who says that to sin against the Spirit cannot be forgiven. Yet if He is not one with the Father as He tells us that He is, then He commits that sin

Himself, and to what end? (I could not doubt the existence of the Father.) That . . . is not the logic of an impostor nor the logic of a madman, rather it is the "logic" which puts the seed in the ground to become a corrupt mess in order that the fair tree may grow in all its straightness and stand even as the five birches now stand grouped in peace outside my window. And if this Christ is God, then what is the worth of all His words? Mind cannot measure and will cannot ignore. He founded a Church. Better, say that He extended Himself into space and time and to be outside that extension is to be apart from Him. So this weary branch must be grafted into the vine, and perhaps be pruned so soon in order that others may drink of the juices of its grapes. I am so happy . . . not excited, for what is emotion? It is beautiful perhaps like the flight of a bird soaring into the heavens. But the bird returns to the nest from which it started and so the beauty of movement does not indicate progress. The snail has no beauty of movement, but it gets from one place to the other. Even so . . .

The little child who folds its hands and says, "et benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus . . ." makes all the learnings of the wise and the teachings of the sages seem as emptiness. I will cast out my thoughts into the void, and what do I find? I find the Eternal Word of God and I am happy.

Yet I shall not see you (for I cannot leave China.) Our poet Po Chu-I says,

> "When shall we meet and drink a cup of wine
> And laughing gaze into each others eyes?"

That we shall do. For we shall meet in the uplifted chalice. There, all are one. The wise men seek for Unity. We shall have it there in Him . . . Eternal blessings be upon you until the Heaven and the Earth mingle and all is well again.

My greetings then . . . Pray for this humblest and weakest of men. Lift up your hands to the Christ for me and if you do not hear, pray that in the pains of Purgatory I may give that love and that Love which I want to be all His. I take the name of John, for in the Apocalypse there is much that only the East can understand. More than that. A man who breathed in time to the heartbeats of Christ, how much he can do to keep me close to that Christ. In the approach to the East I think that it is best to bring the Gospel of St. John and the fulness of the Apocalypse, and to derive more teaching from St. Augustine rather than St. Thomas Aquinas. Humble apologies if I offend your Western scholars.

So this child of the East will come to Him and worship. I will bring the incense of my life to Him, balmed for the burying, gold for the refining.

Salutations then. The Lady of the Heaven of Heavens smooth your brow of all cares and your soul of all fears. We are travelling the same dusty road, while it reaches to the blue heavens and there at least we are one, for if there is to be a union of soul whether it be in marriage or in friendship, there must be unity in the spirit of the same Unseen things, and that means now in Christ.

He loves you and ask Him for me to try to love me in His Mercy and His infinite compassion . . .

The second letter follows:

I take great risk in writing this to you. I am in prison as a "political" suspect, but humbly suggest that it is because it is *politic* and not because it is

politics . . . I hope that somehow this will get to you. If I fail, it does not matter. I am guilty. If they are lucky, they will find some evidence; if they are not, then I am still guilty. That is all that matters to them. When a soul believes (and they have souls dear friend have they not?) then that soul needs no reasons. He believes and that is enough.

I know that I shall never leave this place. I know it as I know that when I am gone to the Father the sun will still be rising each day over these brown fields and the lotus trees. For I shall only leave here if I forsake Christ. So I shall not leave here.

As each slow silent hour drops down like the raindrops dripping from the window sill to the soaking earth below, I feel that I can become more and more like to the Christ. I am unjustly accused, so was He. I will be wrongly condemned, so was He. He loved His enemies. Ah, dear friend, that is very hard. It is hard to do more than pity them in their loneliness and their spiritual squalor. But to love them is hard. It is even as hard to see Christ in their hands, the hands that want to hurt and to torture me and to kill me. Yet I can see His Hands even there, drawing me to Him, as the sun, though it burns, draws the blossom from the bud and the scent from the blossom.

If I am good enough to go to Him then I will be closer to you than I have ever been before. So do not be sorry for me and do not be sorry for yourself. You have the Christ and He loves you. We are safe in His Arms. "Arms so strong to clasp and hold me . . . Voice that oft of Love has told me . . ." It is the moments when we are with Him that alone matter. So, dear friend, it is no worse for me to be here, and no better for you to be there if it is not so. It is all Love and it is all lovely, this Christ, this Truth. We should not mind that we feel sad about things, but mind that so few understand.

Our poet, Wu-Ti wrote, "Did you not know that people hide their love like a flower that seems too precious to be picked?" There is a hand, most eager, most tender that it will not damage the blossom. It is the Hand of the Christ. He will pluck the flower that is held to Him, as I feel my humble self to be held even now.

I can say no more. I am very tired and now I must pray . . . Be glad with me. In the Christ we are one. Till the stars fall into the sea, and the Lord is come again, Salutations and greetings.

AN ANGLO-CATHOLIC PROTEST

In recent years, the authorities of the Church of England, encouraged by the Archbishop of Canterbury, have shown great concern for the problem of Christian disunity. They have entertained schemes of reunion with Protestant bodies of no episcopal pretentions, and have entered into direct discussion with them, intending to achieve, if not organic union, at least intercommunion or merely more intimate interconfessional relations. The Catholicizing or Anglo-Catholic group has looked upon this activity with great misgiving, seeing in it a threat to their theory of apostolic succession and a genuine Catholic tradition in the Established Church of England.

Already Lambeth Palace has countenanced agreements and hopes of agreements which place the Catholic claims in an acutely embarrassing position. The Union of South India has become a reality[1], a union in Ceylon is under

1) Cf. J. Gill, *Lambeth 1948 and the Theology of Orders, Unitas,* Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 11-21; Also J. Birch, *An Interesting Question, Unitas,* Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 142-146.

consideration[2], conversations with the Free Churches have been published in an optimistic *Report on Church Relations in England*[3]. A Report on *Relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland* as well as discussions held at Oslo with representatives of the Protestants in Norway, Denmark, and Iceland have fanned the flame and heaped further grievances upon the mounting Anglo-Catholic discontent.

A recent event connected with the Festival of Britain (celebrating the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851, and designed to strengthen confidence in Britain's future) precipitated a public expression of the discontent which had been brewing within the Catholicizing party.

A "United Rally of Christian Churches" was organized by a committee which had been established by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and which worked under the aegis of the British Council of Churches. Along with the Anglicans, the Baptist Union, the Congregational Union, the Methodist Church and the Presbyterian Church of England were to participate. A series of interconfessional functions was scheduled.

On May 11, the *Church Times* (Anglican) printed a protest to the rally signed by 74 Anglican clergymen. In explaining their concern they declared:

"We feel that such an act can but give the non-Christian spectator a false idea of the religious life of the country. We also think that the participation of the Church of England may give the additional impression that the Roman Catholics are the only religious body which defends the full Catholic faith. Whatever may be the intention of the organizers, the effect can hardly fail to be an emphasis on the 'churches,' with the Church of England as one, even if the leading one, among a multiplicity of sects."

The declaration continued with an announcement of a public "affirmation that the faith of the Church of England is the historic faith and tradition of the undivided Church."

The "Rally of Christian Churches" took place at Hyde Park, London, and was attended by some 8,000 people. The service was conducted by the Bishop of London and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council. One address was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury and another by a Methodist minister.

In the course of his address, the Archbishop said, "we of many Churches gather to demonstrate our faith and make our prayer that the Christian religion and the Christian Church may continue still to direct and govern the hearts of our people, the social ordering of our lives, our place and influence in the British Commonwealth and in the Councils of the Nations." He further made the constatation that " We are still divided, still a long way from being in the full sense, one Body in Christ. But we have learned not to let our differences blind us to our common faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Redeemer of men."

The Anglo-Catholic's stand of one Church, which in England would be embodied in the Anglican community, finds no place in the Archbishop's pronouncements.

While this rally was being held at Hyde Park, a sort of counter-rally in the guise of an "affirmation of faith" was taking place at the (Anglican)

2) For information on the Ceylon Scheme of Union as well as other relations referred to here of Anglicans with non-episcopal confessions, see series of news items under heading *Ecumenism and Reunion* in this issue.

3) cf. *Unitas*, Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 43-46.

Church of the Annunciation. When about 750 people had filled the church to the limits of its capacity, many more were turned away.

The Nicene Creed was recited, and a sermon delivered by the Rev. Hugh Ross Williamson, who explained his position thus:

"We have met this afternoon to reaffirm that between those who accept the sacramental faith and those who deny it there is a difference which no pretence of identity can bridge. When we say—as we repeat so often—that 'God is not bound by the sacraments,' we mean, with all our hearts, what we say. But we mean equally the conclusion of that sentence: 'God is not bound by the sacraments—but we *are*.' We, as Christians, are bound by those actions, not because we chose them. We are bound by them because God revealed them . . . The sacraments are the marks he gave to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, by which men might know she is indeed his Mystical Body."

The protest gave occasion to a variety of interesting comments in the press. We quote passages from a letter signed *Pro Ecclesia* published in the *Church Times* of May 18:

"Clearly, many Churchmen will consider that such a protest is unfortunate and ill considered, and that the proposed rally is a gesture of friendship, and at any rate, harmless. What is likely to be overlooked is that it is the 'last straw' in a series of plans and acts which are perpetually obscuring the very things which the Archbishop so emphatically stated.

"We have plans and schemes for reunion which sit lightly to the Catholic creeds and quite artificially separate faith and order. The South Indian scheme has been hastily put into effect, with the result that four dioceses are lost to the Anglican Communion (which has thus failed in its special responsibility;) and we have a new denomination not in communion with the Anglican Communion, and a large group of continuing Anglicans whose conscience is barely respected and who are, to a large extent, frowned upon by Anglican authorities.

"The proposed scheme in Ceylon is calculated to produce a similar situation. During the Festival of Britain we have already had a series of services (many in our Cathedrals) which have lauded the British way of life and culture, but at which none of the creeds have been recited. Is this because of the presence of Free Church ministers? It is no wonder that many are to say the least bewildered, and cannot understand how the Archbishop's statement can be reconciled with all these 'goings on.' We have a right to look to the throne of Canterbury and the bishops of these two provinces to proclaim the faith as this Church and Realm hath received it . . .

"No wonder they are bewildered to see a service advertised at which the Archbishop of Canterbury is to take part with the Moderator of the Free Churches, whose position depends upon his conscientious repudiation of the authority of the Archbishop, and the claim of the Church of England to be the Catholic Church in this land . . ."

A statement from a letter to the editor published in the *Church Times* of June 1 further clarifies the preoccupations of the objectors: ". . . it is reported that his Grace (Archbishop of Canterbury) began his address by saying, 'In the Rally, we of many Churches gather in the name of Christ . . .' It is against this common, but unscriptural, assumption that there are 'many Churches' of which the Church of England happens to be one, that many are compelled to protest. Either the Church of England is the Catholic Church of Christ in this country, or it is one among a multiplicity of sects. Which is the official view today?"

The Bishop of Peterborough (Anglican,) takes the part of a kindly peacemaker in a letter printed in the *Church Times* of June 1. In justifying both the contending parties he takes refuge in the open question: *what is the Church, what is the nature of the Church?* But this question which he evokes in all innocence is an even more troublesome thing than the Evangelical-Catholicist quarrel which he would appease. It was engendered by the ecumenical movement and projected into the midst of Protestantism where it remains as a perplexing enigma demanding satisfaction. He writes:

"Neither side can charge the other with having done anything wrong or illegal. Both sides are eager in the cause of Christian unity. Both sides are obeying conscience in what they do or do not do. Great problems about the nature of the Church are being raised, and in the coming years they will have to be patiently and faithfully worked out by the guidance of the Spirit of God . . ."

The same number of *Church Times* carries a fine letter from Rev. H.R.T. Brandreth, OGS. We select some significant fragments:

"Sir, I am a member of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, and am deeply grateful for the spirit of Christian love I find at its meetings. Christian unity is the preoccupation of my life, and I have a horror of the tearing and wounding of the Body of Christ which our divisions cause; nor would I dare to attempt to justify that wounding by the largely humanist edifice of toleration built upon it . . . It is simply not true to say that Catholic principles as anyone who is a Catholic (in the sense of the Anglo-Catholic view that the Church of England is the Catholic Church in England) would understand that phrase, are not at this time endangered. They are endangered in each and every one of the Reports on our relations with Protestant bodies which have been published in recent years. Of course, we protest, not out of disrespect for either the persons or the office of the Archbishop and bishop . . . It is not, please God, because we are lacking in love for Protestants. We protest because we believe that the deepest and most fundamental thing in our lives, the faith by which we live and which our Church has given us, is in peril."

The protest at the Church of the Annunciation reflects the trend of the Catholicizing element in the Church of England to clarify its stand on a most Catholic conviction: There is one Catholic Church; because of its divine nature it must not be confused with sects which lack apostolic orders. Any suggestion of parity with these bodies necessarily compromises divine doctrine, an apostolic, sacramentally ordained priesthood, and the sacramental system, and in fine constitutes a denial of a visible Church whose authority rests upon divine institution.

It could hardly be a mistake to recognize a genuine Catholic sentiment in this protest. In fact, it has less the ring of a protest than it has of a distinct affirmation of faith, and the expression of a will to embrace the totality of divine faith left by Christ in His infinite mercy for the sanctification of His sons and brothers. Is it not an impulse of the Spirit of God moving among the heirs of the Oxford Movement and becoming ever more articulate? About 100 years ago a few pioneers set out to regain what had been lost when the Archbishop of Canterbury first swerved from the full current of Catholic tradition. Now a throng of Anglicans representing a vigorous party within the Anglican communion publicly calls for the whole Catholic heritage as its right. We are more consoled by their progress than we are regretful that they

should still hope to find the living Catholic tradition in the Established Church whose history and official teachings are strongly redolent of the Evangelical confessions with which the Archbishop of Canterbury fraternized at the Hyde Park Rally. Indeed, their conscientious endeavours to defend the One, Holy, and Apostolic Church should in due time receive their recompense.

SALVATOR BUTLER, S. A.

News

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

The Pauline Celebrations in Greece

On the occasion of the 19th centenary of St. Paul's arrival in Greece and of the preaching of Christianity on European soil, a grandiose programme of festivities was celebrated from the 15th to the 30th of June, not only at Athens, but throughout Greece. It was the desire of the dissident Greek Church to commemorate this event by a pilgrimage to the places where the Apostle had once been, and where he had preached and founded Christian communities. The pilgrimage was at the same time conceived as a great manifestation of Christian faith and spiritual fervor in the midst of our modern world.

In order to give this celebration fitting proportions, the Archbishop of Athens and of all Greece had invited, through Mr. Hamilcar Alivisatos, professor at the University of Athens, and organizer of the festivities, representatives of the different Christian confessions of both the Old and the New World. Fr. Christopher Dumont, O. P., from the "Istina" Center of Studies, Paris, Dom P. Dumont of the Benedictine Monastery of Amay-Chevetogne, and I were priviliged to take part as Catholics and personally invited guests at this jubilatory celebration. To give an idea of the importance of the throng of guests, we note the presence of a great number of Metropolitans representing the Orthodox Churches of Greece, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch (in the person of the Patriarch Alexander himself,) Jerusalem, Cyprus, Yugoslavia, the Russian emigres (in the person of Msgr. Cassien, rector of the Institute of St. Sergius of Paris;) of three Coptic Bishops (Abunas of Cairo, Karthoum, and Harrar;) of Anglican prelates, among whom were the Archbishop of Armagh (Ireland,) the Bishops of Derby and of Gibraltar, the Bishops of the Episcopalian and Methodist Churches of Buffalo and New York (U.S.A.;) of Lutheran Bishops of Finland, Berlin and Hanover; representatives of the Reformed Church (Professors Clavier and Lemaitre, respectively of the Universities of Strasburg and Geneva, the Pastors Dominicé, Brovon and Hoyois;) of the General Secretary, Mr. Visser t'Hooft, and Rev. Tomkins, adjunct Secretary General of the World Council of Churches; and of an important delegation from the Orthodox Church of Finland.

There were moreover a great number of professors of theology from the Universities of Athens and Salonika, Basel, Marburg, Belgrade, Stockholm, Oslo, Copenhagen, Utrecht, and Leyden. The organization committee had also thought to invite several leaders from among the representatives of youth movements of Greece, Antioch, England, America, and the Scandinavian countries.

Not only the organization of the pilgrimage, but the spirit which prevailed in it was beyond praise. The group left Athens on a cruiser. The pilgrims debarked successively at Cavala (the ancient Neapolis where Paul first landed,) from whence they went to Philippi; at Salonika, where they visited the sanctuaries illustrative of the ancient Thessalonika. From Salonika they went to Verria (Beroea.) Returning by the Aegean Sea through the Canal and Gulf of Corinth, they arrived at Prevesa for a visit to Nicopolis. Continuing along the coast of Ithaca and the Peloponnesus, the ship arrived at the Isle of Crete passing along the southern coast, and where, after a stop before Kalai

Limenes in memory of the Apostle's shipwreck, it docked at the port of Herakleion where the pilgrims were given a welcome. Next, they left for the Island of Rhodes, and landed at Lindos in a small harbor at the foot of the splendid Acropolis where Paul had landed on his way to Rhodes. Passing through the Cyclades, the ship returned to Corinth, important center of Paul's preaching and labours. The pilgrimage terminated at Athens where it was crowned by impressive ceremonies, among which the most grandiose and the most moving was doubtless the first vespers of St. Paul, sung or the Areopagus in presence of the sovereigns of Greece, distinguished officials, and an immense congregation of the laity. In all of the apostolic places, prayers and doxologies were recited, and in the large cities, Liturgies were celebrated. During the trip and within the programme of the pilgrimage, conferences and lectures of a Scriptural and exegetical sort were given on the Apostle Paul.

Everywhere the presence and the welcome of the official authorities, and the participation of a fervent and enthusiastic populace, gave occasion to those who experienced this pilgrimage to admire how the Christian faith has remained live on Grecian soil after centuries of oppression under Islamic domination and how it still combats the forces of materialism which strive to overcome it. The great number of priests massacred and even crucified during the recent civil war, and the hundreds of churches destroyed, have contributed not a little to strengthen the bonds of the people and the nation with the Church of Greece, which enjoys great prestige.

On the other hand, the numerous contacts that such a pilgrimage brought about between the participants, offered an occasion to know and appreciate the effort of a Christian renewal which is being realized in Greece. Especially among the youth, the movement "ZOE" works for a deepening of spiritual life through a liturgical and sacramental restoration, and by an intensified interest in the problems which modern life places before the Christian.

These Pauline festivities in Greece were not only a grandiose celebration of an incomparably memorable event but it was also a manifestation of ecclesiastical and popular faith to which its witnesses can only render homage.

EDWARD BEAUDUIN

* * * *

Archbishop of Canterbury on Anglican Relations with Non-Episcopal Confessions

AT THE Canterbury "Convocation" which took place in May the Archbishop made significant statements on relations with non-episcopal confessions.

Referring to the recently published report on the Ceylon Scheme of union, he said, "This report is to be distinguished from all the others, in that it and it alone deals directly with a scheme of reunion. All the others deal with the relations which may exist or come to exist between Churches which remain separate Churches." He recalled that the Lambeth Conference of 1948 had termed it the most promising of the various schemes of its type, and expressed the hope that it be carried into effect. He declared that the Church of England was not responsible for the Ceylon Scheme, and though it was the work of a very responsible and representative committee, it is not an official utterance of the Church of England.

After describing the complicated procedure which would be entailed in a possible effectuation of it, he cited an opinion that it could not be accom-

plished in less than six years. He then quoted from Resolution 56 of the last Lambeth Conference as follows: "Because the Anglican Communion is itself a treasured unity with a special vocation, a part of our Communion contemplating a step which would involve its withdrawal from the Anglican family of Churches should consult the Lambeth Conference or the Provinces and member Churches of this family of Churches before final committment to such a course."

He then referred to the Report on Church Relations in England and the Report on Relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, adding that a report on the discussions held in Oslo was expected soon. He said, "All these reports are concerned with inter-Church or inter-denominational relations . . . this topic is not the same as that of reunion . . ."

He dealt at great length with the inter-confessional discussions which have recently been promoted, explaining and defending them. In this regard he declared, "It is just because the Church of England has not abated any one of her Catholic principles that she is divided on the one hand from the Free Churches as on the other hand from the Church of Rome. These reports discuss the question what relations can properly exist between us and the Free Churches . . . Even the Church of Rome has had to consider its relations with other Churches, and has issued a special instruction on the subject which approves concerted action to defend 'the Christian religion against the enemies leagued together against God'." Although he refers to the Holy Office's Instruction as a precedent, it must be observed that he neglects to refer to its clearly enunciated cautions against any dealings which would seem to put the Catholic Church in a position of parity with other Christian confessions.

In treating specifically of the character of the Reports, he said, "They and any other reports which deal with inter-Church relations and not with reunion may ask one or both of two questions: 1. What more can be done, while the existing constitutions of the Churches remain unchanged, in the field of improving Church relations? 2. What changes in the constitutions of the Churches concerned would enable relations closer than can otherwise be attained to be established as a step towards ultimate reunion?"

"The Report on Church Relations in England deals with the second of these two questions—and there all the other important questions hinge upon the crucial point that the Free Church or Churches concerned should be willing to accept the office and the essential requirements and functions of the historic episcopate as one necessary element in any advance towards reunion . . .

"The Report on relations with the Church of Scotland is concerned with the first of the two questions. No change in the constitution of either Church is suggested." It suggests interchange of preachers and admission in certain circumstances of members of the Church of Scotland to communion. The report on discussions with the Churches of Norway, Denmark, and Iceland would make similar recommendations. "Relations with the Church of Finland were defined by the Convocations in 1935, but by some oversight, I imagine, similar relations with the Church of Sweden . . . which were recommended by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 . . . have never been before the Convocations."

He continues by protesting that there is no intention of sacrificing Anglican tradition. He proposes certain crucial questions:

"Where are the boundaries of the visible Church of Christ to be drawn?

What range of common belief is necessary between two Churches to enable any inter-Church relation? Where relationships can exist, what forms can they take ranging from bare recognition of one another on the one side up to such relationship as we have with the Old Catholic Churches on the other side? What relations are admissible with non-episcopal Churches and on what grounds are they to be allowed or refused? How far does a formal relationship convey necessarily or at all our approval of all the doctrine or liturgical practice of the other Church or Churches? Such questions relate in the main to non-episcopal churches . . . Other questions arise . . . in particular the question whether their (episcopal churches') existing relations of full communion with Churches which are and which will remain non-episcopal are compatible with our entering into some degree of intercommunion with them . . ." (Guardian.)

Anglican Theologians Report on Scheme for Church Union in Ceylon

The Scheme for Church Union in Ceylon[1] is the title of the report issued by the committee of Anglican theologians appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the scheme for a fusion with various confessions as set forth in the draft prepared by the negotiating committee in 1949. The Bishop of Derby, who was chairman of the theologians' committee, contributes a foreword in which he recalls earlier discussions dating back to the first conference of Church leaders on Church Union in Ceylon in 1934. The scheme recommended that the proposed new Church of Lanka (the Singhalese name for Ceylon) should include the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist Churches in Ceylon, as well as the Colombo and Kurunagala dioceses of the Church of India.

According to the report, the committee as a whole shares the conviction of the Lambeth Committee on *The Unity of the Church* which stated that the Ceylon scheme was of singular interest and promise. The Lambeth Conference of 1948 described it as the most promising of the various schemes of its type, and expressed the hope that "subject to the assent of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon the projected union may under the blessing of God, in due course be carried into effect."

It is recognized that the Church of Lanka, when constituted, will form no part of the Anglican Communion, "although it will have with it the closest links both of ethos and liturgy."

The most far-reaching difference between this scheme and the South India scheme is the provision whereby the Church of Lanka proposes to avoid the difficulties of any interim period by securing a full unification of the ministry of the several Churches from the beginning. "It may be hoped," says the report, "that the theologians of the non-Anglican Churches will be content to note that the reality of their existing ministries of the Word and Sacraments is affirmed in the Scheme . . ."

The Committee finds that the provisions for the unification of the ministry give clear evidence of the intention of the projected Church of Lanka to secure for itself "a ministry fully valid and unexceptionable in Anglican eyes." Provisions are made for setting up "an episcopate continuous in order, consecration and functions with the episcopate of the past" and standing in "historic continuity with that of the undivided Church." In the section of the Constitution dealing with *The Faith of the Church*, there is a return to the earlier form of

1) Church Information Board, Westminster, London; Price one shilling six pence.

the South India statement of faith, "which Anglican opinion has throughout regarded as unexceptionable."

The report recalls a precedent in relation to the "Old Catholic Churches" which suggests a possible concordat of intercommunion between the Anglican communities and the proposed Church of Lanka, and discusses problems which might arise for Anglicans in regard to intercommunion between that Church and other Churches not yet episcopal.

The Committee which issued this report represented a wide range of theological outlook among Anglican leaders, including the Bishop of Durham, Bishop Stephen Neill, Canon H. J. Carpenter, Dom Gregory Dix, Prof. S. L. Greenslade, Prof. Leonard Hodgson, Prof. Norman Sykes, and Canon A. R. Vidler. (EPS)

Conversations between "Church of England" and "Church of Scotland"

Renewed conversations between representatives appointed on behalf of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian—Calvinistic) to examine relations between those communities, have led to unanimous recommendations included in the joint report, published on May 1, 1941. (Church Information Board, Church House, Westminster, price: 2/9d.) It is acknowledged in the report that there are "formidable barriers" and unresolved differences which at present preclude the attainment of full unity. A long-term policy is called for, in which the entire range of the differences between the two communities would be fully and frankly discussed. Meanwhile as a short-term policy it is recommended among other things:

1. that authority in the Church of England should formally sanction the extension to ministers of the Church of Scotland of invitations to preach in parish churches in England;

2. that formal approval should in like manner be given to the acceptance by ministers of the Church of England (subject to due reference to the appropriate Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland) of invitations to preach in parish churches in Scotland;

3. that authority in the Church of Scotland should formally sanction the admission to Holy Communion in the Church of England (subject to the consent of the Ordinary) of baptized communicant members of the Church of Scotland, cut off by distance from convenience of access to the ministrations of their own community, or in special personal circumstances.

The representatives of both the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, along with the two observers appointed on behalf of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, are in common argreement on the recommendations.

The chairmen of the conversations were the Bishop of Derby for the Anglicans and Rev. Professor William Manso for the Presbyterians. Earlier conversations had taken place from 1932 to 1934. A fresh start was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury's 1946 sermon at Cambridge. (EPS)

Conversations Between Anglicans and Scandinavian Lutherans

A special committee to promote closer relations between the Church of England and the Scandinavian Lutheran communities was formed at Oslo in a conference held at the end of March. It was attended by representatives of the Church of England and the Lutheran groups of Denmark, Norway, and Iceland. Five of the 12 delegates belonged to the Anglican community, three each to the Norwegian and Danish communions, and one to that of Iceland.

The following were named as members of the committee: Dr. Eivind Berggrav, former Primate of Norway, Professor Regin Prenter of Denmark, chairman of the Commission on Theology of the *Lutheran World Federation*, and Professor S. L. Greenslade, of Durham, England.

Doctrinal and practical matters bearing upon the relation between the confessions and possibility of full communion between them were discussed. Each delegation prepared a report for the authorities of its own community. (EPS)

New Publications of Faith and Order Commission

The Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches has recently published two pamphlets entitled *Ways of Worship* and *Intercommunion*, in preparation for the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, to be held at Lund, Sweden, in 1952. The reports deal with differences in worship existing among the various confessions. *Ways of Worship* analyses the broad traditions in worship, pointing out the influence of both doctrinal and cultural differences within them. *Intercommunion* centers upon the specific problem of obstacles to unity in Holy Communion, of apostolic succession and valid orders for the ministry. There is also a discussion of the celebration of Holy Communion at ecumenical services of worship. These reports may be obtained from the S. C. M. Press in London, the offices of the World Council of Churches, 39 Doughty Street, London, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, and 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva. (EPS)

Difficulties of Episcopal Church on Terms "Catholic'" and "Protestant"

The four representatives of the Episcopal Church on the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. have published a report in which they take note of objections that have been raised to the general designation "Protestant" used to describe member groups of the N. C. C. It pointed out the increasing use of phrases such as "the cooperating Churches" or "the constituent Churches."

"We realize," said the report, "that the 'Protestant-Catholic' position of our own Church raises some peculiarly difficult questions regarding our participation in the new National Council. The four Orthodox Churches in the Council keep their position well defined, whereas we Episcopalians tend to be grouped under the general designation 'Protestant Churches' with the other Protestant Churches.

"Our Church is under continuous handicaps in maintaining its dual nature, because not only the Roman, but also the Protestant Churches regard us as 'Protestant;' because we are the only Protestant Church (in the U. S. A.) which has the name 'Protestant' as a part of its official title (i. e. Protestant Episcopal Church;) . . . We recognize that there is a problem . . . and we desire to maintain our dual Catholic-Protestant position, but we find it difficult to commend a word or phrase which describes the nature of the National Council of Churches, without at the same time doing violence to the faith of the Episcopal Church." (EPS)

Dissident Greek Church to Become Member of N. C. C.

The dissident Greek Church in America has applied to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. for permanent membership. This group will bring the number of dissident Orientals to five. Those already

participating are the Rumanian Orthodox Episcopate in America, the Russian Orthodox Church in America, the Syrian Antioch Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in America. It comprises 25 Protestant Churches, and represents some 32 million American Christians. (cf. UNITAS, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 46, and No. 2, p. 105.) (EPS)

Methodist Statement on Ecumenism

In a "Message to the Methodists of the World" signed by the Presidents of the Methodist Ecumenical Council, and sent out in preparation for the Methodist Ecumenical Conference held at Oxford, England, in August and September, the following statement is made: "For years past boasting has been excluded and the Church has subjected itself to a ruthless self-criticism. Old rivalries and animosities within Christendom are losing their force. Reunion is the order of the day . . . We of the Methodist family are in the full swing of that world-wide movement (W. C. C.) We have our own part to play. Our loyalty is pledged to the World Council, and we can only rejoice that Methodism has lost its denominational life to live again in a wider fellowship in the United Church of Canada and in the Church of South India. We look forward with eager hope to a similar union of the Christian forces in Ceylon and North India." (EPS)

Southern Baptists of U. S. A. Against Ecumenism

At the Southern Baptist Convention which took place at San Francisco at the end of June a resolution was made denouncing "compromising" ecumenical movements:

"We hereby reaffirm our conviction that Southern Baptists cannot enter into organic connection with the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches or any other unionizing organization which would compromise Baptist principles and doctrines as revealed in the inspired word of God . . ."

The rigid stand of the Southern Baptists is at variance with a more liberal attitude adopted by the Northern Baptists.

Comments of Bishop Staehlin at Bolzano

The Rt. Rev. Wilhelm Staehlin, Bishop of Oldenburg (Lutheran) in an address which he gave to a gathering at Bolzano, and at which about forty Catholic priests were present, spoke of encounters between the various confessions. He remarked, "More and more often, Bible study provides the common basis of discussion at meetings of Lutheran and Roman Catholic theologians . . ."

On ecumenism he said, "The past has shown that ecumenical encounters are by no means to be taken lightly . . . They are an exciting venture. No one knows in advance what the result may be . . . Each Church should feel responsible for its own task and its own knowledge of the truth . . . recent experiences have shown that serious and fruitful encounters between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic Churches are possible. After carrying on our polemics for four centuries and widening the breach between us more and more, we now try to sit down and read the Bible together whenever this is possible . . . The fact that we do again speak with one another, that each of us realizes the task of his own Church and the truth committed to it, is a great step forward for Christendom. What else may result from this, God alone knows, for the greatest things are always hidden things." (LWFIS)

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Association for Refugee Intellectuals

On June 28, in the auditorium of the Magisterium of Our Lady of the Assumption at Rome, the Association of Refugee Intellectuals in Italy (AIRI) was officially inaugurated. So far its members include representatives from Albanian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, Slovenian, Slovak, Ukrainian, and Hungarian intellectuals. This Association has been organized as a consequence of an appeal for assistance to refugee intellectuals made at the Pax Romana Congress at Amsterdam, August, 1950, and was realized with the interested cooperation of the Italian Catholic Action, and other Catholic associations, principally UNITAS and the *Movimento Laureati Cattolici.*

Besides a large number of refugee intellectuals, there were present at the solemn inauguration personages of the ecclesiastical, cultural, and diplomatic world: H. E. Cardinal Pizzardo, the Ambassadors of Spain and Portugal, representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Public Instruction, Fr. Charles Boyer, President of UNITAS, Fr. Emil Herman, Rector of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, and many others. Vittorino Veronese, President of the new Association, gave an address in which he stated the motives which led to the establishment of the Association. Prof. Ernest Koliqi, Secretary General, speaking in the name of the intellectuals in exile described the purposes of the (AIRI:)

1. To defend and develop the spiritual and cultural patrimony of the peoples under the yoke of atheistic totalitarianism; 2. to further spiritual unity and the mutual comprehension among the various national groups, now sharing a common ideal of opposing materialism and defending the values of Christian civilization; 3. to give moral and material aid to the university students and scholars who carry on creative endeavors; 4. to facilitate by means of meetings, publications, conversations, conferences, and artistic manifestations the reciprocal exchange of cultural and scientific knowledge among the representatives of the central European cultures.

On the following day, Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul, His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant celebrated the inaugural Mass at the Church of St. Clement for the intentions of the oppressed peoples. A large group of the intellectual refugees assisted.

A very moving and significant event took place several days before the official inauguration. A reception took place in the monumental 15th Century courtyard of the Palazzo Salviati. Guests of more than 13 different nationalities gathered there and became acquainted with one another. The evening ended in a spirit of general brotherly friendship which augured well for a life of spiritual cooperation and unity to come.

* * * *

ENGLAND

Centenary of Cardinal Manning's Reception into Catholic Church

The 100th anniversary of Cardinal Manning's reception into the Church was solemnly commemorated at the Church of St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater, London, in May. A Pontifical High Mass was celebrated by Bishop

Craven in the presence of Archbishop Myers, Coadjutor of Westminster. A distinguished representation of the Clergy and the Religious communities assisted along with a great crowd of the laity. A Manning Exhibition had been arranged in the adjoining school. Fr. Francis O' D. Hoare, an Oblate of St. Charles (the congregation established by Cardinal Manning,) and the last survivor of the priests who served under the celebrated Cardinal, was also present.

An Inter-Confessional Meeting

In May the third inter-confessional meeting on joint Christian Action took place at Central Hall, London and was attended by about 1,500 people. The purpose of these meetings is to discover means by which the individual and the national community may best help to prevent a third world war.

Bishop George L. Craven, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster, represented the Archbishop of Westminster. Other leaders of the major religious confessions, including the Archbishop of Canterbury (Anglican,) attended.

An address was given by Mr. Richard Stokes, Catholic member of the British Cabinet. Another was given by Dr. Karl Arnold, Prime Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, also a Catholic. (NC)

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Catholic Monthly for Lebanese Catholics

Rev. Joseph Abood, pastor of the Syro-Maronite Church of Cincinnati, has begun the publication of a mimeographed seven-page bulletin entitled *A-Shararat* (Spark.) It is printed by mimeograph in the Arabic language, and since Arabic characters are not to be had on typewriters, the characters are done by hand on the wax stencils. It is planned to write phonetically in Latin characters in future issues. A publication to revive the cultural interest of the Lebanese in the United States in their Eastern liturgy and their Lebanese culture would satisfy an urgent need, as is testified by the subscriptions coming in to the editor from many American cities.

The two first issues of the magazine contained articles on the liturgy, news items, stories, poems, pictures, Lebanon history, and a page of humor. Future issues will contain English translations of prayers from the Mass and other liturgical texts, along with the Arabic equivalent. (NC)

* * * *

CANADA

New Ruthenian Cathedral at Winnipeg

In July the new Cathedral for the Ruthenians at Winnipeg, dedicated to St. Vladimir and St. Olga was consecrated. His Eminence Cardinal MacGuigan, Latin Archbishop of Toronto, and His Excellency Basil Ladyka, Ruthenian Archbishop of Winnepeg, performed the ceremony with the assistance of other prelates and clergy.

New Byzantine Rite Church at Toronto

A new church of Byzantine rite dedicated to St. Nicholas was opened in July at Toronto for the ministry of Catholic Ukrainians in exile. The consecration of this church, which is now the largest of Toronto, was celebrated by His Excellency Isidore Borecky, Apostolic Exarch of Eastern Canada.

GERMANY

Activities of German Catholic Unio

The Catholica Unio of Germany in recent months has organized a series of days of study on problems of union with the dissident Orientals. They were as follows: "Oriental Days" for the parish and the Pallotine Fathers of Ompe (Westphalia,) conferences with projections on the Oriental Church at Alsleben (Franken,) "Oriental Church Days" for the Benedictine Abbey and the parish of Niederaltaich (Bavaria,) and "Oriental Day" in the Diocesan Seminary of Miltenberg, and a "Week of Union" during the Unity Octave in the church of the Augustinians at Wurzburg. (Oss. Rom.)

Benedictine Monastery Founded in Schleswig-Holstein

A new Benedictine Monastery was inaugurated at Bad Oldesloe in the Diocese of Osnabrueck in May. It is situated in the midst of the "diaspora" region. The Abbey of St. Joseph at Gerleve, Westphalia, sponsored the new foundation.

This is the first Catholic monastery to be established in this region since the time of the Reformation.

* * * *

SPAIN

Maronite Major Seminary at Salamanca

At the end of the current vacation period, the Major Maronite Seminary of St. Ephrem at Salamanca will be transferred to its new and definitive quarters on the grounds of the Salamanca University in a building which has been well equipped to receive 30 students for the priesthood.

The Maronite Seminary was established at Salamanca four years ago according to the desire of the Maronite Patriarch, and with the benevolent encouragment of the Spanish Government which allotted 30 scholarships for Maronite vocations.

The 17 Seminarians who were prepared at that time took up their studies in a temporary house in the Barrio Vidal at Salamanca. Fr. Anthony Indary, a distinguished Lebanese Missionary who had for many years administered the Maronites of Argentina, was called to act as Rector of the Seminary.

It is intended that priests will be prepared at this house for ministry among the numerous Maronites now living in Latin America. Students will be sent from South America to attend the Seminary. It should constitute a very useful center of training for students from both Lebanon and South America. The language and the Liturgy will be studied in an atmosphere which is not too different from that of the students' place of origin.

Adequate vocations for the Maronite rite are to be found in the Americas. Because of the lack of Maronite seminaries, it frequently happens that Maronite candidates for the priesthood change to Latin rite, while the need of Maronite priests becomes constantly more pressing. (F. Zayek)

* * * *

RUMANIA

"The Council of the Latin Rite of Alba Julia" at the Service of the Communists

In its efforts to create a schismatic Catholic Church in Rumania, the Communists have appropriated "The Council of the Latin Rite of Alba Julia," also known as the "Status Catholicus." It is an ancient Catholic organization

that traditionally championed Catholic rights in a country where dissident Orientals predominated.

This *Council* was first formed in Transylvania about 250 years ago. During the Reformation a large part of the Transylvanian nobility with their followers espoused the Protestant movement. Church property was confiscated and Catholic worship suppressed. At the end of the 17th century the rights of Catholics to public worship were restored. The *Status Catholicus* was then created with both lay and ecclesiastic members and charged with the administration of the Church property. It was also consulted about the appointment of Bishops.

In 1767, Empress Maria Theresa of Austria set up a "Catholic Commission," subject to the Government to take the place of the *Status,* and its powers were greatly restricted throughout the 19th cenury.

In 1918, when Transylvania was ceded to Rumania by the Treaty of the Trianon, the *Status Catholicus* became involved in many difficulties and problems, both with the Rumanian government and the Holy See. In 1932, a supplement to the concordat between the Vatican and the Rumanian government recognized "The Council of the Latin Rite of Alba Julia," and permitted it to administer all property which formerly belonged to the *Status.* Msgr. Durcovici, later Bishop of Iassy, was largely instrumental in effecting a full accord between the *Council* and the Rumanian government.

Under the Communist regime, the Rumanian Bishops were imprisoned and deported. The influential priests and laymen of the *Council* were eliminated by arrest and deportation, and collaborators of the regime were infiltrated into the organization. When this faction of apostates gained control, it called a meeting in which it adopted a program expressing the desires of the Catholics which had long been ignored: renovation of the Cathedrals of Alba Julia and Cluj-Gherla, the reopening of the Battyaneum Library and the Catholic Museum, and the repair of Catholic churches in five other cities.

A Council delegation, headed by the Canon Fodor, a Communist collaborator, called on the Rumanian Minister of Religious Affairs, Stanciu Stoian, who publicly endorsed the program, and granted a moderate sum of money which permitted repair work to be begun on the Cathedral of Alba Julia.

On March 15 of this year, the Council held a general meeting and decided to take steps "to bring the Roman Catholic Church within the legal order of the state and thus fulfill the ardent desires of all peace-loving Roman Catholics in Rumania." The Regime has recognized the Council as the legal representative for the Latin-rite Church in all Rumania and has offered state salaries to priests who agree to adhere to the Council (NC)

* * * *

PALESTINE

Dissident Russian Church Property

An official representative of the Soviet government has arrived in Jerusalem to administer properties of the "Russian Orthodox Church in Israel." The properties were turned over to the Soviet government in 1949 by the Israel government.

The large Tabitha convent near Tel Aviv has been closed to visitors and is being used for housing the Soviet legation's technical staff and wireless section. (EPS)

LEBANON

30 Catholics in New Parliament

The new Parliament of Lebanon, elected on April 15 and 22, numbers 77 deputies, instead of 55 as in the preceding Parliament. The seats are divided as follows: 42 Christians: 30 Catholics (23 Maronites, 5 Greek Catholics, 1 Armenian Catholic, and one Latin Catholic who as in the preceding Parliament functions as representative of the "minorities") 8 dissident Greeks, 3 Gregorian Armenians and 1 Protestant. There are 35 non-Christians, namely, 5 Druzes, and 30 Mohammedans. (Fides)

"Friends of Union"

An association which has adopted the name *Friends of Union* has been founded at Beyrouth. Its purpose is to strive for "Psychological rapprochement" between Catholics and dissidents of Greek rite. The *Friends of Union* intend to promote understanding and reunion among the Christian churches by means of prayer. (NC)

* * * *

TURKEY

Religious Statistics

The newspaper "Yeni Sabah" recently published statistics on the religions practiced in Turkey as follows: Mohammedans, 18,497,801; Catholics of all rites (Latin, Greek, Armenian, Chaldean,) 21,950; Dissident Orientals, 103,839; Protestants, 5,213; Gregorian Armenians, 60,260; Israelites, 70,000; no religion, 561. These statistics are doubtless based on a census made last year. (Fides)

Preparations for a "Pan-Orthodox Council"

A committee of dissident Oriental metropolitans has been named by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople to visit the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch and confer with them on ecclesiastical matters, especially the proposed "Pan-Orthodox Council" to be convened by the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras. (EPS)

* * * *

EGYPT

Catholics, Dissident Orientals and Protestants form Political Party

A *Christian Democratic Party of Egypt,* with an executive committee composed of Catholics, "Orthodox" and Protestants has been formed according to an announcement made at Cairo. The party intends to bring together all Egyptian Christians to care for their common interests and safeguard their Constitutional rights.

It claims that its members could elect at least 70 deputies to Parliament. These deputies would be in a position to defend the rights of Christian minorities, and effect an understanding with their Moslem countrymen in the spirit of brotherhood.

Among the important points of the party's program are: 1. The founding

of Egypt's policy on a national basis free from religious or racial basis (Islam is at present the state religion, the basis of Egyptian legislation and culture.) 2. The accession of Egypt without reservation to the Rights of Man Charter and the Genocide Convention; separation of the state from religion; full voting rights to all citizens, both male and female. 3. Closing of government offices on Christian festivals. 4. Freedom of conversion to another religion according to dictates of conscience, and without suffering persecution and disqualification. 5. Equality of treatment for all religious communities in matters of propaganda and the broadcasting of religious services and sermons; abolition of discriminatory measures in public post appointments. (NC)

Church Architecture Exhibit

An exhibit of Armenian ecclesiastical architecture opened at Cairo in May. It was sponsored by a joint committee of Catholic and dissident Armenians under the patronage of the Egyptian Minister of Education.

The exhibit comprises models, drawings, engravings, and plans which had been displayed at the Holy Year Sacred Art exhibit in Rome. They represent old historical churches of Armenia dating as far back as the year 288, when St. Gregory the Illuminator founded the Church in Armenia. (NC)

* * * *

INDIA

Three New Colleges Planned

Plans have been made for three new colleges in South India, which would bring the Catholic colleges in India to the number of 45.

One of the colleges is being built by Archbishop Augustine Kandathil of Ernakulam of Syro-Malabar rite. A three-man commission appointed by the Travancore State University, composed of a Catholic priest, a Moslem and a Hindu, has given unanimous approval for this college to be established at Moovatupuszha. It should be open for classes in June 1952.

Bishop Mar Severios of Tiruvalla, of Syro-Malankar rite, has applied to the government for approval of a women's college at Tiruvalla, and Bishop Matthew Kavukat of Changanacherry has applied for another women's college to be erected in his city. (NC)

Book Reviews

GUGLIELMO DE VRIES, S. J., *Oriente Cristiano Ieri E Oggi*; Rome: Edizioni "*La Civiltà Cattolica*," 400 pp.

Fr. De Vries' manual, *Oriente Cristiano Ieri e Oggi*, gives a complete and thorough introduction to Christians of the Oriental rites, both Catholic and dissident. The author is a professor of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, and a frequent contributor on Oriental current events in the *Civilta Cattolica*.

He divides his matter into two parts. The first part recounts the origin and development of the various rites of the Oriental Church, the divisions that resulted as the result of Christological heresies or jurisdictional disputes, the various unions—permanent or ephemeral—between particular groups and the Church of Rome. This section is composed with exceptional soundness and clarity of analysis and would afford even the general reader the possibility of forming accurate notions on the intricately complicated picture of the Oriental Church.

The second section is devoted to recent events and trends in the Christian East up to the days when the Iron Curtain descended. The author gives no quarter to the urge to sentimalize or sensationalize that often colours the presentation of actualities, but delivers a dispassionate account of facts which he has carefully selected for their objective significance.

The volume is thoroughly indexed, contains a simple but complete chart of Oriental rites and jurisdictions for ready reference, and has a special bibliography of works in modern languages at the end of each chapter to supplement the general bibliography.

A German edition is in preparation (Augustinus Verlag, Wuerzburg.) A translation into English would be heartily appreciated since it is a book which is wanting to satisfy a pressing need.

DUNSTAN DONOVAN, S. A.